

THE STORY OF ATHENS

**The fragments of the local
chronicles of Attika**

**Edited and translated
and with an introduction
and commentary by
Phillip Harding**



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

THE STORY OF ATHENS

**The fragments of the local
chronicles of Attika**

**Edited and translated
and with an introduction
and commentary by
Phillip Harding**



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

THE STORY OF ATHENS

**The fragments of the local
chronicles of Attika**

**Edited and translated
and with an introduction
and commentary by
Phillip Harding**



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

THE STORY OF ATHENS

The Atthidographers were a series of historians who chronicled the local history of Athens. From the end of the fifth century to the middle of the third several authors wrote Atthides and their works have survived only in fragments (about 300 in all), many of which are crucial sources of information for the ancient historian. *The Story of Athens* represents a unique combination of oral and written traditions of Attika, the land of Athens, from mythical to historical times, written in chronicle form. This is the first time that the fragments of all the Atthidographers have been made available in an accessible translation for the use of students and teachers.

The fragments are presented in chronological order (rather than author by author), so as to aid the reader in visualizing the shape of the Athenian Chronicle. With an introduction that situates the genre in its historiographic context and commentary throughout, this book explores Athenian religion and cults, political history, military events and much more through the extant fragments of the Athenian chroniclers.

Phillip Harding is Professor Emeritus at the Department of Classical, Near Eastern and Religious Studies at The University of British Columbia.

THE STORY OF ATHENS

The fragments of the local chronicles of Attika

Edited and translated and with an introduction and commentary by

Phillip Harding

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEWYORK

First published 2008
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group
This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2007.

To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.

© 2008 Phillip Harding

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN13: 978-1-134-30446-2 ePub ISBN
ISBN10: 0-415-33808-5 (hbk)
ISBN10: 0-415-33809-3 (pbk)
ISBN10: 0-203-44834-0 (ebk)
ISBN13: 978-0-415-33808-0 (hbk)
ISBN13: 978-0-415-33809-7 (pbk)
ISBN13: 978-0-203-44834-2 (ebk)

FOR MADELEINE AND RUSSELL

CONTENTS

Preface xii
List of
abbreviations
xiv
Editorial
conventions
xvi

Introduction

1

1

The
Erekhtheid
Dynasty:
Kekrops to
Kranaos 13
Autochthony
and ancestry
14
Tritopatores
17
Ogygos and
Aktaios 18
Kekrops 20
Pelasgians
23
The
daughters of
Kekrops and
the birth of
Erikhthonios
27
Erysikhthon
29
Kranaos 30
Areiopagos
to Aigeus 33
The

2

Areiopagos
 33
Amphiktyon
 36
Erikhthonios
and the
Panathenaia
 39
Pandion 142
Erekhtheus
 42
Kekrops II
 47
Pandion II
and the
Athenian
claim to
Megara 48
Aigeus 50
Theseus the
archetypical
Athenian 52
Theseus and
the
Pallantidai
 54
Theseus the
wrestler 55
Theseus, the
Marathonian
bull and
Hekale 56
Theseus and
the Kretan
Minotaur 57
Theseus and
the
Oskhophoria
 61
Theseus and
the Isthmian
Games 63
Theseus and
the Amazons

64

*Theseus and
women* 67

*Theseus
protector of
suppliants* 70

*Exile of
Theseus* 72

**4 Trojan War
to the end of
the
monarchy** 73

Menestheus
73

Demophon
75

Oxyntes 77
Apheidas 77
Thymoites
77

Melanthos
78

Kodros 78
Medon 78
Life-rulers
82

*Ten-year-
rulers* 83

**5 Kreon to
Xanthippos:
683/2–479/8**
86

*Kreon – first
annual
archon* 86

Drakon 87

*Solon –
archon and
diallaktes* 88

*The
seisakhtheia*
88

*The
nomothesia*

89
Peisistratos
90
Hipparkhos
92

*Owls and
bulls: the
history of
Athenian
coinage* 93

*The
Alkmaionidai
and the
temple of
Apollo at
Delphi* 94

*The great
freeze* 96

*Expulsion of
the
Peisistratidai*
96

*The reforms
of Kleisthenes*
97

*Fortification
of the
Peiraieus* 102

*The Persian
Wars* 102

*Xerxes’
invasion* 103

6

**The
Pentekontaetia
and the
Peloponnesian
War: 478/7–
404/3** 107

*The
Pentekontaetia*
107

THE
BATTLE OF
EURYMEDON

107
THE
MESSENIAN
REVOLT
FROM
SPARTA 108
THE
REFORMS
OF
EPHIALTES
110
ATHENIAN
WAR WITH
AIGINA?
110
DEATH OF
KIMON 111

INTRODUCTION
OF THE
THEORIKON
111
THE
SECOND
SACRED
WAR 112
PERIKLES
REGAINS
EUBOIA 113

PSAMMETIKHOS'
GIFT OF
GRAIN 114
EXILE OF
THUCYDIDES,
SON OF
MELESIAS
115
THE
STRATEGOI
AT SAMOS
116
PHEIDIAS
AND THE

STATUE OF
ATHENA
117

FOUNDATION
OF
AMPHIPOLIS
118

BUILDING
OF THE
PROPYLAIA
119

METON
THE
ASTRONOMER
119

THE
GYMNASION
AT
LYKEION
120

MILITARY
ORGANIZATION
AT ATHENS
BEFORE
THE
PELOPONNESIAN
WAR 120

*The
Peloponnesian
War 121*

BEGINNING
OF THE
WAR 121

PHORMION
123

ATHENIAN
GENERALS
IN SICILY
123

SPARTAN
OVERTURES

TO ATHENS
OVER
PYLOS 124
SIEGE OF
SKIONE 125
ATHENIAN
CAMPAIGN
AGAINST
EUBOIA 125
DEATH OF
KLEON 125

PANAKTON
126
PEACE OF
NIKIAS 126
BATTLE
OF
MANTINEIA
127

OSTRACISM
OF
HYPERBOLOS
127

THE
LINEAGE
OF THE
ORATOR
ANDOKIDES
127

THE
MUTILATION
OF THE
HERMS,
PROFANATION
OF THE
MYSTERIES
AND
OTHER
BAD
OMENS
BEFORE
THE

SICILIAN
EXPEDITION
128

DEATH (?)
OF
PERDIKKAS,
KING OF
MAKEDONIA
130

DEATH OF
THE SEER,
STILBIDES,
AND
DEFEAT OF
THE
SICILIAN
EXPEDITION
131

AN
AMNESTY
FOR EXILES
AFTER THE
DEFEAT IN
SICILY? 131

THE
SYNGRAPHEIS
132

THE
ATHENIANS
BEGIN TO
USE THE
RESERVE
FUND 132

KLEOPHON
PERSUADES
THE
ATHENIANS
TO REJECT
SPARTAN
OVERTURES
FOR PEACE
133

ADMINISTRATIVE
CHANGES
AFTER THE
RESTORATION
OF
DEMOCRACY
134

SPARTAN
EMBASSY
TO ATHENS
FOR AN
EXCHANGE
OF
PRISONERS
135

THE
RETURN OF
ALKIBIADES
TO ATHENS
135

THE
BATTLE OF
ARGINOUSAI
136

THE
ATHENIANS
MINT
COINS
FROM THE
GOLDEN
NIKAI 136

TRIAL OF
THE
GENERALS
FROM
ARGINOUSAI
137

*The period
of oligarchy
139*

*Capture of
Athenian
ambassadors
by Sparta 140*

*Konon's
campaigns
141*

*Death of
Dorieus, the
athlete 142*

*Alliance
between
Athens and
Boiotia 142*

*Battle of
Nemea 143*

*Rebuilding
the walls of
Athens 143*

*Athenian
mercenary
force at
Korinth 144*

*Peace
negotiations
of 392/1 145*

*Capture of
the Theban
Kadmeia by
Phoibidas
146*

*Reorganization
of the
taxation
system at
Athens 146*

*The peace of
375/4 147*

The

*Arkadian
league 148*

*Androton
creates new
ceremonial
equipment
148*

*Affairs in
Thrace 149*

*The Social
War, 357/6–
355/4 150*

*Trial of
Timotheos,
son of Konon
151*

*Athens
opposes
Philip of
Macedon at
Thermopylai
151*

*Philip seizes
an Athenian
sacred
Trireme 152*

*Athens
sends
Kleroukhs to
Samos 153*

*Dispute
between
Athens and
Megara over
the Sacred
Orgas 153*

*Athenian aid
for Olynthos
154*

*Philip
captures
Olynthos 155
Lives of the
philosophers*

155

*Revision of
the
citizenship
list in Athens*
157

8

**The peace of
Philokrates
to the
Archonship
of Philippos:
346/5–292/1**
159

*Athens
rebuffs
Artaxerxes’
approach* 159
*Diopetithes
in the
Hellespont*
160

*Athens
liberates
Oreus and
Eretria from
tyranny* 161
*Athens
declares war
on Philip of
Macedon* 161
*Philip and
Athens seek
alliance with
Thebes* 164

*Prosecution
and death of
Theoris the
prophetess*
165

*Harpalos’
money* 166
*Death of
Demosthenes*
167

*The
administration
of Demetrios
of Phaleron,
318/17–308/7
168*

*Demetrios
of Phaleron
and his
supporters
are driven out
of Athens;
Demetrios
Poliorketes
and his father
Antigonos are
welcomed in
170*

*Philokhoros
predicts the
recall of the
exiles 171*

*Demetrios
initiated into
the Mysteries
172*

*Deinarkhos
and other
exiles return
173*

Appendix 1:	Translation of remaining unassigned fragments by author 174
Appendix 2:	Notes on Kekrops 191
Appendix 3:	Notes on pelasgians 196
Appendix 4:	Notes on the daughters of Kekrops 199

Appendix 5:	Notes on Erysikhthon 203
Appendix 6:	Notes on Areiopagos 205
Appendix 7:	Notes on Amphiktyon 210
Appendix 8:	Notes on Erekhtheus 213
	<i>The arrival of Demeter and her gift of grain to Triptolemos 213</i>
	<i>Eumolpos and the war between Athens and Eleusis 214</i>
	<i>Erekhtheus' daughters/the Hyakinthides 215</i>
	<i>Ion 216</i>
	<i>The Skira(phoria) 217</i>
	<i>Bibliography 218</i>
	<i>Concordance of fragments 227</i>
	<i>Index of passages cited 232</i>
	<i>Index of names 240</i>

PREFACE

When the idea of this work was first broached to me by Richard Stoneman, the suggestion was that it should simply be a translation of all fragments of the *Atthidographers*, author by author, following the enumeration and using the text of Jacoby in *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. His view was that to have such a collection between two covers would be a useful resource to students and teachers of ancient history. It soon became apparent that this would not be satisfactory. In the first place, whilst budget limitations made it unreasonable to provide a commentary of the scope of Jacoby's, some interpretation of the fragments was necessary if they were to be useful. It was decided that this interpretation should be more extensive for the less well-known period of the kings, when the *Atthidographers* were using, abusing, or manipulating oral traditions in order to provide a pseudo-historical base for Athenian religious, legal, social and administrative practices (or, as some might say, 'inventing' classical Athens). Some of this commentary was so extensive, in fact, that it ended up in appendices. It was felt that commentary on the 'historical' period, when the *Atthidographers* were chronicling data, could be kept to a minimum, often merely a reference to a more familiar version of the events by Thucydides or the like. Indeed, some fragments that lack a clearly datable context or are simply names have been relegated to an appendix (see [Appendix 1](#)) without commentary.

The second departure from the original concept involves the ordering of the fragments. They are no longer arranged by author, as they were by Jacoby and will be in the revision of his work (the so-called *Brill's New Jacoby*), but by topic and date. The reasons for this are laid out in the Introduction, but in essence it is hoped that this will provide the reader with a more accessible understanding of the nature of the *Atthis* and, at the same time, make it easier to see where and how the individual authors differed.

Third, though the majority of the translation will be based upon the text that can be found in Jacoby, in some places that text is incorrect and has had to be replaced. This is especially the case with the scholia to Aristophanes and with the papyrus text of Didymos' *On Demosthenes*. The reader will, of course, be alerted whenever the text translated differs from Jacoby's.

It is, I suppose, mandatory to explain my practice with regard to the

spelling of names. In essence, I have tried to adhere as strictly as possible to the Greek spelling, but have yielded to convention in the case of some really ingrained names, such as Thucydides and Sicily. I do not think the odd departure from the rule will present problems.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank Richard Stoneman for suggesting this idea and for supporting it almost to publication. Also, I want to acknowledge the generosity of Oxford University Press for allowing me to use my translation of the fragments of Androtion from *Androtion and the Atthis* (Oxford University Press 1994), and of some of the fragments of Philokhoros from *Didymos: On Demosthenes* (Oxford University Press 2006). But my greatest gratitude must go to Felix Jacoby, who pioneered the understanding of the *Atthis* and whose work has made this possible.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Androtion</i>	P. Harding, <i>Androtion and the Atthis</i> (Oxford, 1994)
<i>AO</i>	R. Develin, <i>Athenian Officials 684–321 BC</i> (Cambridge, 1989)
<i>APF</i>	J. K. Davies, <i>Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 BC</i> (Oxford, 1971)
<i>ARV²</i>	J. D. Beazley, <i>Athenian Red-Figure Vases</i> , vols i–iii (Oxford, 1963)
<i>ATL</i>	B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor, <i>The Athenian Tribute Lists</i> , 4 vols (Cambridge and Princeton, NJ, 1939–53)
<i>Atthis</i>	F. Jacoby, <i>Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens</i> (Oxford, 1949)
<i>CAH²</i> , <i>CAH³</i>	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , 2nd/3rd edn (Cambridge, 1970–)
<i>Didymos</i>	P. Harding, <i>Didymos: On Demosthenes</i> (Oxford, 2006)
<i>Documents</i>	P. Harding (ed.), <i>From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus</i> (Cambridge, 1985)
<i>FGrHist</i>	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin and Leiden, 1923–)
<i>Fornara</i>	C. Fornara, <i>Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War²</i> (Cambridge, 1983)
<i>Fowler</i>	R. L. Fowler, <i>Early Greek Mythography, I: Texts</i> (Oxford, 2000)
<i>GHI</i>	R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, <i>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC</i> (Oxford, 1969)
<i>Harpokration, Lexikon</i>	J. J. Keaney (ed.), <i>Harpokration: Lexeis of the Ten Orators</i> (Amsterdam, 1991)
<i>HCT</i>	A. W. Gomme, K. J. Dover and A. Andrewes, <i>A Historical Commentary on Thucydides</i> , 5 vols (Oxford, 1957–81)
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> (Berlin, 1873–)
<i>Jacoby, Text</i>	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , vol. 3b Suppl. 1 (Leiden, 1954)
<i>Jacoby, Notes</i>	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , vol. 3b Suppl. 2 (Leiden, 1954)
<i>Rhodes, Commentary</i>	P. J. Rhodes, <i>A Commentary on the</i>

SEG
Souda

*Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*² (Oxford, 1993)

Supplementum Epigraphicum graecum

A. Adler (ed.), *Suidae Lexikon*, 4 vols (Leipzig, 1928–)

EDITORIAL CONVENTIONS

In the Commentary I use familiar editorial conventions, but in the translated texts, especially of inscriptions and papyri, I employ the conventions customary in the editions of such documents. The texts translated are those printed in Jacoby, *FGrHist*: 3b, except where specifically stated otherwise.

()	Indicate an explanatory addition to the text (usually by the editor) or letters left out by abbreviation in the original. In particular, archon-names in brackets beside the dates in the heading of fragments have been supplied and are not attested in the text
[]	Enclose letters words or letters that are no longer extant, but have been restored by modern editors
< >	Indicate letters or words thought to have been omitted from a text by accident
...	Indicate that an unspecified number of letters are missing from a text
	Indicates the end of a line in an inscription or papyrus
/	Indicates the end of a line of verse
(30)	Indicates the number of the line in the original text
*	Indicates a corrupt word or numeral
...	Indicates that the words between the asterisks are corrupt
**	Indicates a corrupt passage
(lacuna)	Indicates that a portion of the text is thought to be missing
Bold type	has been used in the translation to indicate the text of the fragment attributed to the Atthidographer referred to

INTRODUCTION

Atthis or *Attike* (*syngraphe*), meaning ‘the Athenian or Attic (history)’, was the title given in antiquity to a series of monographs, written between the end of the fifth century and the middle of the third BC, that focussed upon Athens and its surrounding territory, Attika. Or rather, this is the way these works were referred to by others; the titles, if any, attached to them by their authors are not preserved, and may have been quite different (*Androtion*: 1–3). It was some time in the Hellenistic period, probably at the hands of the Alexandrian scholar, Kallimakhos, that the abbreviated title *Atthis* became standard, and the authors of these monographs were thenceforth referred to as ‘those who composed the *Atthides*’. Modern scholars have devised the term, *Atthidographers*, to replace this cumbersome periphrasis, and have created the title, *Atthidography*, for the genre of historiography they wrote. These authors and their works are the subject of this volume.

The individual authors, some of whose careers will be outlined below, were, in order of publication: Hellanikos of Lesbos (end of fifth century), Kleidemos of Athens (before mid-fourth century), Androtion of Athens (after 344/3), Phanodemos of Athens (after 329/8), Melanthios (dates unknown), Demon, most likely of Athens (probably first half of the third century) and Philokhoros of Athens (before 260). In addition, there exist fragments from the epitome of the *Atthides*, made by the Hellenistic historian, Istros (of Paphos ?). The works of all these authors have survived only in fragmentary citations in other publications, particularly lexika, and are often garbled and confused. These remains have been subjected to a thorough theoretical analysis by Felix Jacoby (*Atthis*, 1949), who also collected and published them in his great work, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, where they can be found in volume 3b, nos 323a–334. In addition, he devoted two supplementary volumes (in English) to his commentary on them, 3b Supplement I (*Text*) and Supplement II (*Notes*). The fragments are currently in the process of being re-edited by Brill under the title *Brill’s New Jacoby*.

Reaching an understanding of the nature of the histories these authors wrote, let alone re-creating an individual *Atthis*, is not an easy task, and any conclusions arrived at are subject to revision; nevertheless, the pioneering studies by Jacoby and subsequent work by later scholars (especially Bloch 1940 and von Fritz 1940; see further the bibliographic note on the study of the *Atthis* in Harding 2007:187–

8) have advanced our comprehension considerably. The following is a brief summary of the present state of our understanding.

The *Atthis* is a peculiar blend of the oral and written traditions of Attika, that combines vague memories of a distant past (equivalent to the periods we designate by the terms Bronze Age and early Iron Age) with some traditional narratives from the Archaic Period and precise details of documented events from the fifth to the third centuries. Jacoby (*Atthis*: 68) correctly classified it amongst the local chronicles (*horographiai*) that were produced by many Greek *poleis*. He based his classification not only upon the testimony of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*Roman Antiquities*: 1.8.3), but upon his own observation that the authors appear to have structured their narratives in chronicle format around the reigns of kings and the magistracies of eponymous officials. This conclusion is supported by the testimony of the *Souda* (s.v. Philokhoros) and the remains of later chronologies, like the *Marmor Parium* (*FGrHist*: 239), the *Chronika* of Apollodoros (*FGrHist*: 244) and that of Kastor of Rhodes (*FGrHist*: 250), and their successors, Eusebios and Georgios Synkellos, all of which were to some extent based upon the *Atthis* (see Mosshammer 1979:84-168; Adler and Tuffin 2002: xxx–lxxv).

Even before Jacoby wrote, however, it had been customary to refer to the genre as ‘local history’ and the *Atthidographers* as ‘local historians of Attika’ (e.g. Pearson 1942). Jacoby himself adopted these terms, albeit inconsistently. But this designation is less satisfactory than ‘chronicle’ and hardly appropriate in the modern context, where the term ‘local history’ describes a product that is in many respects dissimilar to the *Atthis* (Harding 2007:186). Chronicle is the designation preferred here.

If the form of the *Atthis* was that of a chronicle, it will be no surprise that its style was rather pedestrian. The preserved fragments fully justify the ancient criticism of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*Roman Antiquities*: 1.8.3) that it was ‘monotonous and hard to read.’ That is not to say, however, that it was written in note form, or anything of the sort. The fragments show that the *Atthidographers* wrote full sentences and employed complex syntax. They arranged their entries under the kings by generations, distributing the material they had about a given monarch by principles we cannot discover, and under the eponymous archons annually, introducing the first entry for the year by the name of the magistrate, followed by the formula ‘in the term of office of this man...’. Within each year they recounted each event, to the best of their ability, in its proper temporal order, often thereby breaking up the narrative of a single event by intruding intervening material where it belonged in chronological sequence. An excellent illustration of this principle can be found in Dionysios of

Halikarnassos' first *Letter to Ammaios* (1.9), where he puts together a report of the Athenian reaction to the attack on Olynthos by Philip of Macedon in 349/8, which he had found, interrupted by intervening material, in Philokhoros' account of the events of the archonship of Kallimakhos of Pergase (see *Androtion*: 6–8; Harding 2007:182–3).

But while the style and format of the *Atthis* might have been dull, its contents were varied and far-ranging. The Atthidographer was interested in etymology, topography, family tradition, cult and religion, politics, institutions of administration and the law, proverbs, as well as precise details of recorded history. The early books, which dealt with the period of the kings, were full of 'mythical' accounts of individuals, whose historicity is questionable, to say the least. These tales usually served the function of explaining the origins of features of Athenian society that were fundamental to the national identity. In most cases they appear manifestly fictitious and purposeful and can easily be dismissed as 'unhistorical', on our terms, but they were probably not invented by the Atthidographers; rather they were part of the communal memory of the different groups that populated Attika, to whom they were real and for whom this 'intentional history' represented their 'social knowledge of the past' (Gehrke 2001:286). In this way Athenians could understand who they were, where they had come from, why they worshipped the gods they worshipped or had the institutions they had, and, particularly, could justify their possession of the territory they lived on. To that extent, the early books of a Greek city-state's local chronicle were hardly different from the sort of oral traditional tales preserved by aboriginal communities in many countries to this day.

That is not to say, of course, that, when the first Atthidographer (probably Hellanikos) began to organize these traditional tales into a coherent scheme on a structured chronological framework, he did not massage and manipulate the material to his purpose. This is the very crux of the issue, so much discussed today, of the relationship between oral and literary tradition. He, and those who followed him, used this 'mythico-historical' material, in part, to set up their representation of the more contemporary events that followed. Conversely, no doubt, the past was revised and re-configured by the experience of the present (Thomas 1989: *passim*). A major event like the introduction of democracy had, no doubt, a similar effect upon pre-existing family and popular tradition as, say, the first contact with Europeans had upon the oral traditions of aboriginal peoples. But the past was not *invented*, rather it was *moulded*, when the oral tradition of communal memory evolved into the written chronicle of Attika.

But oral tradition was not the only source of information available to the chronicler. Physical remains of tombs and shrines, as well as

topographical phenomena inspired research and speculation. Furthermore, after the introduction of writing in the eighth century, records were kept, first of the eponymous magistrates (the Archon List), then of legal and constitutional guidelines (the lawcodes of Drakon and Solon), and, probably, administrative directives and decisions pertinent to the individual magistrate's function. Finally, from the time of Kleisthenes onward, all public business was kept on record and much of it was published for all to see (see Sickinger 1999: *passim*). Though it is not an opinion that is popular in all quarters (see e.g. Thomas 1989: *passim*), it is my belief, and one that I shall be following throughout this volume, that the Atthidographers used documentary evidence, whenever they found it, from the very beginning, and that they followed this practice with increasing refinement from one to the other (see *Androtion*: 35–47). I shall not, however, go as far as some (e.g. Shrimpton 1997:147ff.) in arguing that the use of documentary evidence was the quality that distinguished 'local' from 'general' historiography.

In sum, the *Atthis* was not just a doctored literary version of oral tradition, but a complex construct, based upon research into communal memories, physical remains and documentary material. As a work of historiography it resists easy categorization. For example, it partakes of all five sub-species of historiography that Jacoby identified (1909:80–123) in his frequently-referred-to programme for his edition of the fragments: genealogy/ mythography; ethnography; chronography; contemporary history; and local history. I feel that he was quite wrong to assign local history (i.e. the chronicle) to the last place in this development. When the literary *Atthis* is viewed as part of a process from oral to written, it follows that it existed in some form before its first appearance in the written medium. The origins of the local chronicle probably lie as far back as the period of colonization (Giangiulio 2001:116–37), if not earlier (Harding 2007:183–4). Conversely, in the hands of careful researchers, like Androtion and Philokhoros, it evolved in the fourth and third centuries into contemporary history.

It remains in this introduction to discuss briefly two further issues: the relationship of the Atthidographers to each other and their relationship to other works. These are two separate issues, although they have usually been treated *in tandem* since the first major study of the genre by Wilamowitz (1893:260–90). The reason for this is that the Athenian local chronicle attracted Wilamowitz' attention in the context of his analysis of the sources of Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*. He quite rightly perceived that Aristotle had used Atthidographic material in the first, historical, part of his work and he set out to identify the bias of the *Atthis*. This led him to develop his theory of the

existence of a pre-literary chronicle that had been maintained by a body of priestly magistrates (*exegetai*), one of whom anonymously published it at some time early in the fourth century and thus made it available for Aristotle to use. In his opinion the *Atthis* was a monolithic medium with an essentially democratic bias.

It was this theory, put out by his former supervisor and mentor Wilamowitz, that motivated Jacoby to undertake his detailed study of the *Atthis*. He began by disproving the idea of a pre-literary chronicle and banished the anonymous *exegetes* from the discussion definitively (*Atthis*: 1–70). Instead, he laid out a more complex theme, where oral tradition (as preserved mainly by the aristocratic families) played a central role, and the use of, or even existence of, documents was largely rejected. And in place of the monolithic work of basically democratic inclination, Jacoby developed the theory of the ‘political conception of the *Atthis*’, the view that the Atthidographers wrote their histories from a politically ideological perspective (democratic, conservative, moderate), each one writing to refute the interpretation of his predecessor. In this way, he also accounted for the different political biases that refined source-criticism had identified in Aristotle’s *Athēnaion Politeia*, suggesting in particular that the moderately-conservative bias that seemed to characterize much of that work was derived from the *Atthis* of the fourth-century author, Androtion.

This interpretation influenced a whole generation of scholarship on the sources of the *Athēnaion Politeia*, to which the study of Atthidography was up to that point always rather incidental. Fortunately, the most authoritative recent study of Aristotle’s work has re-evaluated his dependence on the *Atthides* and concluded that it was much less than previously suspected, particularly in regard to bias (Rhodes, *Commentary*: 15–28). At the same time, however, Jacoby’s theories created what was to become the canonical view of the relationship of the Atthidographers to each other, namely as a group of politically motivated writers of different ideological persuasions whose purpose in writing was to influence the internal politics of Athens in their own day. It also, of course, established Atthidography as an independent field of study.

But, whilst Jacoby was correct in arguing that the Atthidographers differed from one another, the idea that their difference was over political ideology has recently been challenged and is largely discredited now. Their disagreement could be a matter of emphasis, detail, or even interpretation, but not politics (Harding 1976:186–200; 1977:148–60; *Androtion*: 47–52; Rhodes 1990:73–81; Marincola 1999:313). Conversely, whilst Wilamowitz’ notion of a monolithic chronicle is no longer accepted, the view that there was a largely

common body of material (at least for the history down to the end of the fifth century) has never been questioned and has, in fact, been tacitly accepted by all those who talk of an 'Atthidographic tradition'. The viewpoint adopted in this volume is that there was, indeed, a basic body of traditional material for the period before 400 BC and that this was created by Hellanikos, the founder of the genre. The first *Atthis* was, as one would expect of a local history, especially of a Greek *polis*, partisan (i.e. pro-Athenian) and this probably meant, in the case of Athens, that it espoused the democratic constitution (*Androktion*: 48–9). Subsequent Atthidographers wrote with a view to correcting or expanding his account on points of detail, or, like Androktion and Philokhoros, extending the narrative down to their own times.

Regarding the individual Atthidographers, no detailed biography will be offered here. In the first place, there is little or nothing to be said about some of them, like Melanthios, Demon or, even, Kleidemos, though Jacoby has done his best in his commentary to elicit what he can from the exiguous evidence. Second, detailed biographies of the other four, Hellanikos, Androktion, Phanodemos and Philokhoros, can be found in the introductions to Jacoby's commentary on each in *FGrHist* 3b Suppl. I (and in briefer form in *Androktion*: 9–34). Furthermore, the life and career of Androktion has received special attention from Harding (1976:186–200 and *Androktion*: 13–28) and Moscati Castelnuevo (1980:251–78).

Although there are signs in Herodotos (i.e. at 8.44.2) that some attempt had been made to organize characters from early Athenian legends into some sort of chronological order, suffice it to say here that I adhere to the view, first advanced by Jacoby (*Atthis*: 68ff., 87ff.), that the multi-talented, fifth-century historian, Hellanikos of Lesbos, was the first person to mould the oral traditions of the various regions of Attika into a coherent narrative with a chronological framework. Despite a recent attempt to challenge this view (Joyce 1999), I remain persuaded that Hellanikos was the only person with the skill and experience in mythography, chronography and ethnography to undertake such an assignment (*Androktion*: 9–10, 48–9). By the time he came to write his *Attike syngraphe* (Thuc.: 1.97.2) at the end of the fifth century, he had produced five definitive mythographic studies (*Phoronis*, *Deukalionia*, *Atlantis*, *Asopis* and *Troika*), which established the relationship of the great epic cycles to each other; he had written a number of important ethnographic works (notably on Egypt, Cyprus, Scythia, Persia and several parts of Greece, including his home region of Aeolis); and he had published his *Priestesses of Hera at Argos*, a pioneering attempt to find a viable chronographic system for Greek history (Möller 2001:241–62). As a consequence, he surely recognized the value of the recently inscribed Archon List, and

probably used it as the framework for the second ('historical') part of his two-book work. The first book was on the 'mythical' period of the kings. Only 29 fragments of his whole chronicle are preserved, and three of those can only doubtfully be assigned to his *Atthis*.

Hellānikos established the basic structure and form of the *Atthis*. I believe he also created its thematic tone. Writing at a time of intense nationalism and chauvinism in Athens (the Peloponnesian War), he undoubtedly encountered the patriotic interpretations of Athens' past that were being promoted by the *polis tradition* in other media, such as literature (especially tragedy) and the visual arts. Particularly provocative would have been the propaganda contained in the *epitaphios* (the Funeral Oration; see Loraux 1986: *passim*). All of this emphasized Athens' role as benefactress of Greece, as the bringer of civilization, as saviour from outside invaders, both mythical (e.g. the Amazons) and real (the Persians), and, of course, as founder of the democratic constitution. It would have been incredible if he had resisted the influence of all this material. That does not mean, however, that he or his successors were slaves to Athenian national propaganda, as we shall see from discussion of the fragments.

Though it may seem contradictory to attribute the first Athenian chronicle to a non-Athenian, there is no rule that requires that local history be written by a 'local'. Nevertheless, locals (Athenians) soon stepped forward to amplify and refine his work.

The first was a fourth-century *exegetes* (expounder of sacred law), named Kleidemos. Pausanias, who calls him Kleitodemos, credits him with being the oldest to write an *Atthis* (10.15.5), though he must mean that he was the first Athenian to do so. Precisely when he wrote is not certain, but it was before the middle of the fourth century. He wrote four books, expanding both parts of Hellānikos' chronicle twofold. He may well have titled his work *Protogonia* ('first-creation'; cf. Harpokration, s.v. Pykni; Athenaios *Deipnosophistai*: 14.79, 660AB). If he did, he was choosing to emphasize a theme that was already a well-established part of Athenian national consciousness. We have only 13 fragments of his *Atthis*.

With Androtion, Kleidemos' successor, we meet one of the real personalities amongst the authors of the *Atthis*. He was a fourth-century politician of some significance, whose career covered a period of more than forty years from pre-385 to about 344/3. He was, in fact, the only Attidographer who is known to have played an active part in contemporary politics and it is not surprising that Jacoby built his notion of the political conception of the genre almost exclusively upon his understanding of Androtion's career. The demonstration that his understanding is incorrect has, of course, undermined his theory. A

full study of Androtion's political career can be found in Harding (1976:186–200 and *Androtion*: 19–25).

Not only is Androtion known to us from his involvement in the affairs of his day, both through inscriptions and the speech against him written by Demosthenes (speech 22), but we have more fragments (68) of his chronicle than of any other Attidographer except Philokhoros. Furthermore, there is no doubt that he was known to Aristotle, and used by him in his *Athenaion Politeia*, though not to the extent formerly hypothesized. More importantly, in his case, and his alone, we can be sure of his relationship to one of his successors, because it is beyond doubt that Philokhoros respected his work and used it, at least for the fourth century, as the basis of his own account of that period. The impression we have of Androtion is of a diligent and accurate reporter, especially for the events of his own time. This, in fact, was the focus of his *Atthis*, since five of the eight books he wrote were on the sixty years from the end of the Peloponnesian War to, at least, 344/3 (the last datable fragment). He clearly covered this period in great detail and with such accuracy that Philokhoros found little or nothing to disagree with. By contrast, Androtion devoted only one more book to Athenian history down to the end of the fifth century than Kleidemos had. We have no difficulty, therefore, explaining why Androtion wrote his *Atthis*.

Between Androtion and the last author of the genre, Philokhoros, we have two writers who are little but names, Melanthios and Demon, and one of more significance, Phanodemos. Of Melanthios' *Atthis*, in fact, we have only one fragment. The situation is not much better for Demon, of whose work, which was at least four books long, there are 3 or 4 fragments. At least we can see that these are all concerned with the period of the kings. In the case of Phanodemos, however, we have probably as many as 27 fragments. Furthermore, we actually know something about him.

Phanodemos, the son of Diyllos, of the deme Thymaitadai, is known to history exclusively on the basis of inscriptions. One of these (*IG*, II²: 223) demonstrates that he was a member of the Council of 500 in 343/2 (and thus born before 373/2). Three others (*IG*, VII: 4252–4) attest to his involvement in the administration of the important sanctuary of Amphiaraos at Oropos between 332/1 and 329/8, when it was under Athenian control. In the last of these documents he tops the list of a group of honorands, amongst whom are some very well-known members of the Athenian elite, like Lykourgos, son of Lykophron, of Boutadai; Demades, son of Demeas, of Paiania; Nikeratos, son of Nikias and Thymokhares, son of Phaidros, of Sphettos. Another inscription (*Fouilles de Delphes*: III.i.511) lists him with almost the same people as an official for the Pythais to Delphi.

Phanodemos obviously moved in significant circles and on the basis of this evidence Jacoby dubbed him 'the minister of public worship and education' during the period of Lykourgos' administration (on which see Mitchel 1970:165–214). This is probably going too far, but the testimony of the fragments supports the notion that Phanodemos was more interested in cult than politics and, at the same time, excessively Atheno-centric in his interpretation of the past. What he thought of the history of his own times, if anything, we do not know, since the latest datable fragment (F23) of his work concerns the death of the fifth-century general and politician, Kimon. In fact, he appears to have still been writing about the end of the sixth century in his last attested book (the ninth). We do not know how many more books Phanodemos' *Atthis* contained, nor even if he took his narrative beyond the fifth century. We can only be sure that he devoted much more attention to writing his revisionist version of the early period of Athenian 'history' than any of his predecessors and that he especially differed in this respect from Androtion, his immediate forerunner. This, of course, only makes sense. Since Androtion had recorded the affairs of the fourth century in great detail, the preceding period offered more scope. Furthermore, the mood in Athens after the battle of Khaironeia was one in which the glorious traditions of Athens' past were celebrated with even greater intensity than usual.

Philokhoros, son of Kyknos, was the last of the Atthidographers. He was significant enough a personality to merit a brief biographical entry in the Souda (s. v. Philokhoros; trans. Burstein 1985:80). From this we learn that he was a prophet and diviner, who was born c.340, well before Eratosthenes (275–194), who was his younger contemporary. Moreover, we are told that he was put to death by an Antigonos (surely Gonatas) for supporting Ptolemy (surely Philadelphos). The occasion must be the Khremonidean War, the end of which (262/1) no doubt marks the termination of Philokhoros' life. He wrote an *Atthis* in seventeen books, probably down to shortly before his own death.

Philokhoros had a range of interests that reveals itself in the variety of his publications. He wrote other historical works, like the history of Delos, or the foundation of Salamis; a chronographic work entitled *Olympiads*; works on festivals, sacrifices, the mysteries and the mantic arts; literary studies on Euripides and Alkman; and an assortment of others, like *On Contracts* (?), *On Inventions*, and, perhaps, *Attic Inscriptions*. This range is typical of Hellenistic scholarship, and there is no doubt that Philokhoros was a scholar. Jacoby even goes so far as to claim that 'Ph(ilokhoros) is the first scholar among the Atthidographers' (*Text*: 227), but that is certainly an exaggeration. After all, Hellanikos wrote on almost as many subjects as Philokhoros

and was his precursor in many ways. His scholarship may not have been as sophisticated, but it was scholarship none the less. And, in the case of Androtion, we can be sure that his account of fourth-century Athens was deemed sufficiently scholarly by Philokhoros, because he relied upon it heavily.

We have more than 170 fragments of Philokhoros' monumental seventeen-book chronicle of Athens, of which 74 are cited with title. Thanks to these substantial remains Jacoby has been able to re-create the structure of his *Atthis* with some degree of certainty. The period down to the end of the Peloponnesian War was covered in the first four books, only one longer than Androtion's and much less than Phanodemos'. The next two books (5 and 6) were devoted to the years 404/3 to 322/1 (end of the Lamian War). This was twenty years longer than the fourth-century section of Androtion's work, but it was treated in only two-fifths of the space (two books instead of five). No doubt Philokhoros abbreviated his predecessor's account, though he followed it in essence. Where he became expansive, just like Androtion, was in covering the new material, growing especially detailed as he got down to his own time. He wrote his last eleven books on the years 322/1 to 262/1, covering barely five and a half years in each book! He too, therefore, must be viewed both as a contemporary historian and as an antiquarian.

In addition to the above-named authors, reference is sometimes made in our sources to other people as having written an *Atthis*. Such names are Amelesagoras (*FGrHist*: 330), Hegesinos (*FGrHist*: 331), Bion of Prokonnesos (*FGrHist*: 332), Antiokhos and Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 333). They are all either fictitious or pseudonymous, according to Jacoby (*Text*: 595–6, 598–601, 608–13), but occasionally the fragments attributed to them contain interesting or controversial material. On those occasions, I shall introduce their contribution into the discussion. More important than those, however, is the collection of material derived from the *Atthides*, made by the Hellenistic scholar, Istros. Several of his fragments will be relevant and will be translated, whenever the situation demands.

I hope this gives a brief introduction to what we know about the Atthidographers and their works. They were a varied bunch, with different reasons for writing the Athenian chronicle. Some, like Phanodemos and Kleidemos, were probably more interested in the early period, when so many features of the Athenian identity, especially in the way of religion and cult, were (or were believed to be) formed. Others, like Androtion and Philokhoros, covered the early period more quickly and put the majority of their energy into writing the history of their own times. Both approaches owed their inspiration to the original product by Hellanikos, behind whom lay a long

tradition of oral history, family tradition, gossip and make-believe, informed with increasing frequency by documentary sources (*Androtion*: 47–51).

Finally, a word about the structure and organization of this book. The fact that we have more fragments of Philokhoros than any other Atthidographer shows that he was the most frequently cited author in the genre. This probably indicates that his *Atthis* was judged in antiquity to be the most authoritative. That was certainly the view of Dionysios of Halikarnassos and his contemporary, the Alexandrian scholar Didymos. Indeed, it was through the extensive use of Philokhoros (and, to a lesser extent, Androtion) by the latter that many of the fragments entered the lexicographical tradition, though in the process they suffered considerable abbreviation. It might even be the case that his work was, in fact, the best.

On the other hand the number of citations from Philokhoros could simply result from the fact that his was the longest and latest publication. In either case the statistical evidence is deceptive, in as much as some of the material attributed to Philokhoros may have been derived by him from his predecessors' works. As indicated above, this was certainly the case with the fragments of his chronicle that dealt with the first 60 years of the fourth century, since they were surely cribbed from Androtion to such an extent that it would not be unreasonable to use them to re-create what Androtion wrote (*Androtion*: 33). It is equally possible that he borrowed material from Phanodemos and others, when he was writing about the early period, and that their contribution, to what for lack of a better term one might call the 'Atthidographic tradition', is concealed by the citation-practice of later scholars, as a result of their preference for referring to the most-up-to-date book. (NB The corollary to this, however, may well be that, when a predecessor of Philokhoros is cited alone for some information by an author later than Philokhoros, there must have been a good reason for that, probably that he was particularly responsible for that detail.)

But mentioning the possibility that an *Atthis* might contain a substantial body of common material, some of it going right back to Hellanikos, and the use of the term 'Atthidographic tradition' is to tread on sensitive ground. Since Jacoby's dismissal of Wilamowitz' concept of the *Atthis* as a monolithic genre, based upon one original publication, scholars have quite correctly treated the individual Atthidographers as separate authors in their own right and studied them independently. The manner in which the fragments are presented by Jacoby in *FGrHist* (and will be presented again in *BNJ*), i.e. author by author, further encourages this approach. It is undoubtedly salutary and has had beneficial results upon our understanding of the character

and intent of each writer.

On the other hand, in my experience, I have found that this manner of presentation tends to make it difficult for readers to appreciate the similarities, as well as the differences, between the Atthidographers, and tends to conceal the extent to which they were working upon common material. Some indication of what that material must have looked like, in the political context at least, can be gleaned from the historical part of the *Athenaion Politeia* (chapters 1–41), which must in outline, as mentioned above, be structured upon the Athenian chronicle. There Aristotle would have found the material on the kings, arranged in much the same order, down to the time of the first archon, Kreon. The *Atthis* probably had something to say, as did he, about Kylon and Drakon, and certainly treated the early Areiopagos, Solon, the Peisistratids, Kleisthenes, Themistokles, Ephialtes, Perikles and the political shenanigans of the last decade of the fifth century. The *Atthis* surely had more to say on the Peloponnesian War than Aristotle. And, beyond politics, it was heavily concerned with matters of religion and cult, and the connections of the famous families of Attika with their administration. Later, that common outline was used by the chronographers (derivative sources), like Apollodoros, the author of the *Marmor Parium* and Kastor of Rhodes, to form the basic structure of their chronologies, to which they added assorted data of their own choosing.

The considerations laid out above will explain why I have chosen the structure used in this book. Against the chronological framework adopted by the chronographers of the Hellenistic period, I shall present all the fragments of the Atthidographers that apply to a given personality (e.g. Kekrops) or topic (e.g. the Areiopagos), ordering them chronologically in each case by date of author. The translated fragments will be followed by a commentary. This will be more extensive for the mythical period, because it is more complex and speculative, shorter for the historical fragments, because they are more factual. It will not, however, attempt to address the controversial issues of constitutional or religious practice in the depth they receive in Jacoby's commentary or will receive in the updated version, *Brill's New Jacoby*. I shall only discuss them to the extent that is necessary to elucidate the tone, spirit and practice of the Atthidographers' historiography, so that, while accepting that there was a basic (and to an extent cumulative) format to the *Atthides* (with the exception of the last eleven books of Philokhoros' work), it is hoped that the similarities and differences of each author's treatment of a given subject will become readily apparent. In short, unlike Jacoby's *Atthis*, which presents a theoretic interpretation of the genre, this book will allow the fragments to speak for themselves and leave the readers to

draw their own conclusions.

Some fragments, however, are not suitable for this treatment. These are the ones that contain only a name (of a person or a place), an aberrant spelling, or an otherwise obscure reference. In their case it is very difficult to assign a date or supply a context. For the sake of completeness they will be translated, but only rarely with any comment, in [Appendix 1](#). They will be arranged by author, following the numbers attached to them by Jacoby.

A concordance relating the numbering of the fragments in this book to those in Jacoby's *FGrHist* is provided at the end.

THE EREKHTHEID DYNASTY

KEKROPS TO KRANAOS

The first part of a Greek city-state's local chronicle was concerned with origins and foundations: origins of civilization, in general, and Hellenic, in particular; of the specific people themselves, where they came from, how they reached their present territory (usually involving a 'mythos' justifying their ownership); of their culture; origins of leading families and of names of places and topographical phenomena; foundations of cults and religious practices and festivals, of sacred sites, of legal, administrative and political institutions. In fact, it served to establish the national identity of a *polis*. The Athenian chronicle was in no respect different (Harding 2007: **180–88**).

Such a product would, as indicated in the Introduction, preserve many old stories and tales of uncertain and distant origin, but viewed through the prism of attitudes current at the time of writing. In this respect the Athenian local chronicle was very similar to what a version, written today, of an aboriginal people's account of its origins, looking back past the time of European colonization, would be (e.g. Carlson 2001). It would be easy to see it as a tendentious and self-serving document (as does Loraux 1986 and 2000), but the situation is more complicated than that, since the narrative is infused with memories of vital importance to the community's own 'social knowledge of the past' (Gehrke 2001:286).

The next four chapters will present the fragments of the Atthidographers that relate to the period of the kings. The first will cover the origins of civilization and cover the kings from Kekrops to Kranaos; the second will treat the kings down to Aigeus; the third will be devoted exclusively to Theseus; whilst the fourth will cover the remaining rulers of the post-Trojan War period to the introduction of the annual archonship in 683/2. Most of these monarchs were assigned to two dynasties, the Erekhtheid and the Melanthid. The first and most significant was the former. That dynasty, according to the chronographers, covered the years 1556 (Kastor), or 1581 (*MP*), to the death of Thymoites in 1127 (Kastor), or 1152 (*MP*). The 25-year difference between the two chronographic schemes results from the fact that Kastor was using Eratosthenes' lower date for the Trojan War, a date which obviously cannot have been known to any

Atthidographer before Philokhoros (and probably not even to him). The reigns of the monarchs will be ordered in accordance with the scheme of Kastor of Rhodes (*FGrHist*: 250 F4, with Jacoby's commentary), since he provides the most complete list, but discrepancies with other chronologies (e.g. *MP*) will be noted as appropriate. It goes without saying that these monarchs are not 'historical' personalities in our sense of the word, and consequently that the events associated with their names are not accurate. The kings are 'mythical' characters, not all of whom belong to the strictly Athenian tradition. But they do seem to be associated with one location of Attika or another and their relevance to a time before *synoikismos* (political unification) attests to their antiquity. It was probably Hellanikos who organized them into a succession of rulers, arranged by generation (Jacoby, *Text*: 43–51; *Atthis*: 125–8), though it is clear that some attempt at this had been made before him (Hdt.: 8.44.2) and it is almost certain that later Atthidographers made additions and alterations to his scheme.

I think it might be useful to provide a list of the kings of this dynasty with Kastor's dates presented in modern terms, before moving on to individual topics and personalities revealed by the fragments of the Atthidographers.

1556–1506	Kekrops Diphyes
1506–1497	Kranaos
1497–1487	Amphiktyon, son of Deukalion
1487–1437	Erikhthonios, son of Athena and Hephaistos
1437–1397	Pandion, son of Erikhthonios
1397–1347	Erektheus, son of Pandion
1347–1307	Kekrops II
1307–1282	Pandion II
1282–1234	Aigeus, son of Pandion II
1234–1205	Theseus, son of Aigeus
1205–1183	Menestheus, great-grandson of Erektheus
1183–1150	Demophon, son of Theseus
1150–1136	Oxyntes, son of Demophon
1136–1135	Apheidias, son of Oxyntes
1135–1127	Thymoites, brother of Apheidias

Autochthony and ancestry

1. Hellanikos F27 = Harpokration, s.v. autokhthones: The Athenians. Demosthenes in the (speech) about the false embassy (19.261) ‘for you alone of all men are autokhthons’. Apollodoros in the (books) *About the Gods* (FGrHist: 244 F106) says that they were called autokhthons because they were the first to till the land, that is the soil. But others (say) it is because of the fact that they were not immigrants. Both Pindar and he who wrote the Danaïd say that Erichthonios, the son of Hephaistos, appeared from the ground. **But the Arkadians, too, as Hellanikos says, and the Aiginetans and the Thebans were autokhthons.**

2a. Androtion F60a = Scholion to Euripides, *Phoinissai* 670 (‘Thence earth sent up a fully armed sight...’): Stesikhoros in *Europeia* says that Athena has sowed the teeth. **Androtion, on the other hand, says (they were called) Spartoi because of the fact that, after following Kadmos from Phoinikia, they lived scattered abroad (*sparsim*).**

2b. Androtion F60b = Scholion to Pindar, *Isthmian* 7.13 (‘Or of the Spartoi unwearied at the spear...’): For Pherekydes (FGrHist: 3 F22) says there were two races of Spartoi. For Ares and Athena gave half of the teeth to Kadmos, and (the other) half to Aietes. **But Androtion says that Kadmos, in flight from Phoinikia, came down into Thebes with (a) considerable (number of) dispersed peoples, and that it was from this that they were named Spartoi, because they were mixed people of scattered origin. But the Thebans create false and miraculous tales about them.**

2c. Androtion F60c = Scholion [Tzetzes] to Lykophron, *Alexandra* 494–5, p. 179 b 24 [Scheer] (‘And third is the son of the man who took from the hollow rock the weapon of a giant...’): For Aigeus (was) an Athenian, born from the earth (i.e. autokhthon) and a descendant of Erekhtheus. **But some say that he was also one of those who had sprung up from the teeth of the dragon in Thebes, and so does Androtion.**

3. Phanodemos F13 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 1.61.4: ...Dardanos, on the other hand, founded a city named after himself in the territory that is now called the Troad, on some land that was given to him by the king, Teukros, after whom the

land got its ancient name, Teukris. Many writers, but particularly Phanodemos who wrote the *Attic archaeology*, say that this man (i.e. Teukros) migrated from Attika to Asia, previously being the chief magistrate (archon) of the deme Exupetaieus (Xypete). He provides much evidence in support of his argument. After Teukros had gained control of the extensive territory, which was of good quality and sparsely inhabited, he was glad to see Dardanos and the people of the Greek race who came with him, both because he needed their alliance in his wars against the barbarians and because he did not want the land to become unpopulated.

4a. Philokhoros F2a = Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. *asty*: The polis in general. But there is a difference, in that the one (*asty*) indicates the physical structure, while polis denotes the citizens also. **It was called *asty*, as Philokhoros (says) in the first (eleventh MS) (book) of the *Atthis*, on account of the fact that, previously living as scattered nomads, at that time they stood still (*stenai*) from their wandering and came together into common habitations, from which they have not moved. The Athenians preceded others in building towns (*asty*) and cities (*poleis*).**

4b. Philokhoros F2b = *Etymologicum (Genuinum) Magnum*, p. 160, 5: *Asty*. The polis. **Philokhoros in the first (book) of the *Atthis* says they gave the name *asty* to the *polis* on account of the fact that, previously living as scattered nomads, at that time they stood still from their wandering and came together into common habitations, from which they did not move. So (says) Oros in (the) *On Peoples*.**

Commentary

While the passage from Philokhoros (#4a) is certainly from the first book (the figure in Stephanos must be corrected) and probably belongs to his Introduction (Jacoby, *Text*: 264–5), that cannot be asserted so surely for the passages from Hellanikos and Androtion. Nevertheless, it remains the most likely place for them to have treated the topic of the origin of the Athenian, if not also the Hellenic and even the whole human, race (Jacoby, *Text*: 55; *Androtion*: 188).

Despite the archaeological evidence for their arrival from elsewhere, most aboriginal peoples maintain to this day a belief in the autochthony of their ancestors, or at least ‘express their original connection with the land through such phrases as “We have always been here” or “We have been here since time immemorial” ’ (Carlson 2001:20). This was not generally the case with ancient Greek communities, most of whom preserved traditional tales that described their arrival from outside (e.g. the Spartan story of the return of the Herakleidai) and justified their possession of the land by some tale of divine sponsorship or victory in a contest (just as the Hebrews claimed to have divine justification for depriving the Canaanites of their land). Some, like the Thebans, had conflicting myths of autochthony (the story of the Spartoi, the ‘sown-men’) and immigration (Kadmos). A few claimed to be ‘sons of the soil’ (i.e. the Aiginetans and Arkadians mentioned by Hellanikos), but it was the Athenians who made autochthony and the ancestor-theme into a fundamental feature of their national image and propaganda. This was particularly manifest in the genre of the Funeral Oration (*epitaphios*) from Perikles (in Thucydides 2.36.1) through the orators. It was so hackneyed a theme that Plato saw fit to parody it in his *Menexenos* (237e–238b). The significance of the claim to Athenian civic ideology has been well demonstrated by Loraux (1986: *passim*; 2000: *passim*). In its less pretentious form (that ‘the same people have always inhabited Attika’) it was accepted by the historian Thucydides (1.2.5) and expanded to include the whole Ionian race by Herodotos (1.56.2).

Unfortunately, we do not have an explicit statement from any of the Atthidographers on the topic of the autochthony of the ancestors (*progonoi*) of the Athenian *demos*, though they clearly attributed autochthony to some key individuals, like Kekrops, Erekhtheus and Erikhthonios (on these, and the significance of their association with Ge through their depiction as snakes, see Kearns 1989:110–12).

Nevertheless, we can infer from Hellanikos' statement that he, at least, accepted the Athenian claim, though, interestingly, he denied their exclusive right to it. Perhaps, being an outsider, he saw things in a broader perspective.

Androtion's position is unknown. His use of etymology to reject the Theban claim to autochthony might have been part of a defence of the Athenians' right to it, but he could equally well have been using rationalizing arguments to reject all such claims to be 'born of the earth'. Specifically regarding his attitude toward the Thebans (or Boiotians, in general) see *Androtion*: 186–8. F60c cannot be attributed to Androtion (*Androtion*: 188).

As for the piece from Phanodemos, whose thesis can also be found in Strabo (13.1.48 C604) and in Servius' commentary (on *Aeneid*: 3. 281), we do not know its context at all. It has been included here because at the very least it shows the one-upmanship of the Athenians in the matter of chauvinistic claims about origins – while others laboured hard to create a connection for themselves with heroes from the Trojan War, only the Athenians claimed that the people of the Troad originated in Attika. In addition, it appears that Phanodemos was advocating his view in the context of the wars of the Greeks and barbarians, but that habit was as old as Herodotos (1.1–5).

In the case of Philokhoros, while Jacoby (*Text*: 265) may be correct in asserting that this passage does not 'contain a reference to the autochthony of the Athenians', it is suggestive that he uses very much the same language to describe the Athenians ('scattered nomads') as Androtion had used of the Thebans. For my part, I suspect that the rationalizing tendency evident in most fragments of the Athidographers would have led them to reject the more extreme version of Athenian propaganda that is found in the *epitaphios*. At any rate, we can recognize in this fragment the notion that an essential prerequisite for civilization was the gathering together of people into settled communities, which is not entirely in agreement with the view espoused by the *epitaphios* that Athenians and Athenian civilization were nurtured by the earth, who was both mother and nurse of the autochthons (Plato, *Menexenos*: 237b–238b; Isokrates, *Panegyrikos*: 23–8).

Tritopatores

5. Phanodemos F6/Demon F2/Philokhoros F182 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Tritopatores (Keaney, p. 253): **Demon in the *Atthis* says that the Tritopatores are winds. Philokhoros says that the Tritopatores were born first of all things. For the men of that time used to consider the earth and the sun, whom at that time they also called Apollo, as their parents, and those born of them (they used to call) third fathers (*tritous pateres*). And Phanodemos in the sixth (book) says that only the Athenians sacrifice and pray to them for the birth of children, when they are on the point of getting married.** In the *Physikos* of Orpheus the Tritopatores are named Amalkeides and Protokles and Protokreon, and they are doorkeepers and guards of the winds. He who wrote the *Exegetikon* says that they were born from Ouranos (Sky) and Ge (Earth), and that their names were Kottos, Briareus and Gyges.

Commentary

That the obscure cult of the Tritopatores (or Tritopatreis) was a form of communal ancestor-worship (whether by *gene*, phratries, demes or the whole polis) is possibly the only thing that is agreed about them by modern commentators (see Kearns 1989:76–7; Lambert 1993:368–9; Jameson *et al.* 1993:107–14; Parker 1996:106, 108, 323). Both the spelling of their name and its meaning were disputed even in antiquity, though Philokhoros' explanation 'fathers in the third generation' has won some favour (e.g. Parker 1996:108). Nevertheless, ancient explanations do seem to emphasize their role as ancestors of all mankind. Their cult was especially popular in Attika. Besides Athens, they are listed in the sacred calendars of Marathon and Erkhia (see Jameson *et al.* 1993:107–14). Also they had a sacred space, entrance to which was taboo (*abaton*) as indicated by its boundary-stone, on the Sacred Way outside the city (Travlos 1971:302, fig. 391, 305, figs 394–5). Phanodemos' testimony that they were invoked for procreation supports the assumed connection with ancestry through death and re-birth of the people. But their worship was not exclusive to Attika, as has been shown by the recent publication of a sacred text from Selinous in Sicily (Jameson *et al.* 1993). See the discussion in Jacoby under Phanodemos F6 (*Text*: 181–2).

Ogygos and Aktaios

MP, epoch 1 (1581/0): From the time when Kekrops became king and the land began to be called Kekropia, **though it was previously called Aktike after Aktaios the autokhthon, 1318 years.**

6a. Hellanikos F10a/Philokhoros F92a = Eusebios, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 10,10.7–14 (Africanus): The period before this up to the first Olympiad, according to Akousilaos (*FGrHist*: 2 F23), comprised 1,020 years (i.e. 1796), following the calculation of Attic chronography, (which began) from Ogygos, whom they believed was autochthonous, (and) in whose time occurred the first, great flood in Attika, (at the time when) Phoroneus was king over the Argives... (8). For these facts (are found in) the historians of Athenian affairs, Hellanikos and Philokhoros, authors of the *Atthides*, and (in the historians of) Syrian affairs, Kastor (*FGrHist*: 250 F7) and Thallos (*FGrHist*: 256 F4), and in the universal history of Diodoros, author of the *Bibliothēke*, and in Alexander Polyhistor (*FGrHist*: 272 F101)... (14). And after Ogygos, because of the great destruction caused by the flood, what is now Attike remained without a king until the time of Kekrops (that is) for a period of 189 years (i.e. 1607). **For Philokhoros says that the Aktaios, who came after Ogygos, and the fabricated names did not even exist.**

6b. Hellanikos F10b/Philokhoros F92b = [Justin Martyr], *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 9: And those who recorded the affairs of the Athenians, both Hellanikos and Philokhoros, he (*sic*) who (wrote) the *Atthides*, also Kastor and Thallos and Alexander the Polyhistor, and furthermore the wisest (authors), those who wrote the history of the Jewish people, both Philon and Josephos, make mention of Moses as being a very ancient ruler of the Jews from long ago.

Commentary

Of the two Atthidographic fragments only the citation from Eusebios (using Africanus' *Chronographiai* according to Jacoby, *Notes*: 278) is useful. The other, from Justin Martyr, though it is clearly from the same source, is too garbled and compressed to be helpful. The chronological computations belong to the chronographic tradition and are not those of either of the Atthidographers, to whose purpose such data were irrelevant (see Harding 2007: 181). The calculations are not even those represented by chronographers, like Kastor and *MP*, who employed an *Atthis* as a source. They probably derive from one who was attempting to blend Judaio-Christian computations of floods with Greek traditions. The likeliest candidate is Alexander Polyhistor (Jacoby, *Text*: 387).

Ogygos was, supposedly, a primeval, aboriginal figure most clearly associated with the Thebaid, where he was said to have been king of the Ektenes, the pre-Greek tribe believed to have been the first inhabitants of the land (Pausanias: 9.5.1). Other places in the vicinity claimed him as progenitor, e.g. Aulis, which was said to have been named after a daughter of his (Pausanias: 9.19.5) and Alalkomenai, near Haliartos, which also claimed to have been named after one of his daughters (Pausanias: 9.33.4). Even the eponym of the city of Eleusis was in one tradition thought to have been his son (Pausanias: 1.38.7). At some time, as this fragment shows, Ogygos was dragged into the pre-historic story of Athens/Attika, as the ruler at the time of a destructive flood. This flood was purportedly even earlier than the one associated with Deukalion. Unlike Deukalion, however, whose myth had clear Hellenic significance, Ogygos had little relevance other than as a chronological reference point. That is to say, he represented humanity at a time before the arrival of the Hellenes.

While the figure, Ogygos, is only attested later in Greek literature, with the possible exception that it might be present on a Linear B tablet, PY 61 (see Ventris and Chadwick 1973:199, 564), the adjective, *ogygios*, is found in the earliest authors, Homer and Hesiod. Its etymology is unknown, but it apparently signified something of extreme age and is often translated as 'primeval'. Kalypso's island was *ogygian* (or Ogygia, 'land of Ogygos'; see Homer, *Odyssey*: 1.85), as was the imperishable water of the Styx, upon which the gods swore (Hesiod, *Theogony*: 806). Pindar used the adjective to describe the mountains of Phleious in Arkadia (*Nemean*: 6.44), while Aiskhylos

could refer to both Thebes (v.37) and Athens (v.975) as *ogygian* in the same play, *Persai*. Given this meaning for the adjective, it is not difficult to see how an Ogygos could evolve into a personality of antediluvian dimension for Greek storytellers.

Despite this, however, Jacoby is certainly correct in arguing that Ogygos was not a character in either Hellanikos' or Philokhoros' *Atthis* (*Text*: 380–9). In fact, he appears not to have been part of any *Atthis*, since he is not referred to by any Atthidographer, nor mentioned in an Athenian context by any author who is known to have derived his material from an *Atthis*, like Pausanias, *MP* or Kastor.

The same cannot be said about Aktaios. *MP* (above) followed a tradition that viewed Aktaios as an autochthon, after whom Attika had been named before Kekrops became king, when its name was changed to Kekropia. His tradition did not, however, treat Aktaios as a pre-Kekropian king, as did Pausanias, who says (1.2.6): 'They say that Aktaios was the first to rule as king in what is now Attika; but, when he died, his son-in-law, Kekrops, succeeded to the monarchy...'. This tradition was undoubtedly the work of one of the Atthidographers, though it is impossible to say which one. It is not very likely to have been Hellanikos (see the discussion in Jacoby, *Text*: 380–9; *Notes*: 278–84), and certainly was not Philokhoros. The one sure conclusion we can draw from the garbled information of the Eusebian passage is that Philokhoros rejected the existence of any king of Attika before Kekrops, who was the first king of Attika in the view of most Atthidographers and Athenians (cf. Thuk.: 2. 15. 1). Aktaios was not known to any fifth-century author and was probably invented as part of the attempt to trace the etymology of the name Attika, which was not agreed upon (see Pausanias: 1.2.6; Strabo: 9.1.18 C397; Herodotos: 8.44.2; Jacoby, *Text*: 399).

Kekrops

MP (Heading): [From records] *of all kinds* [and general histories] I have recorded [the dates] *from the beginning*, starting from **Kekrops, who first was king over the Athenians**, down to the archonship of [...] in Paros, and, at Athens, of Diognetos (264/3).

MP, epoch 1 (1581/0 = 1556/5 Kastor): From the time when **Kekrops became king and the land began to be called Kekropia**, though it was previously called Aktike after Aktaios the autokhthon, **1318 years.**

MP, epoch 2 (1573/2 = 1548/7 Kastor): From the time when Deukalion was king in Lykoreia near Parnassos, **when Kekrops was king in Athens, 1310 years.**

7. Philokhoros F93 = Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias*: p. 289 (Mosshammer): The first to rule the Athenians as king was Kekrops Diphyes, (for) 50 years. The year of the world was 3945. Kekrops Diphyes (= of double-form or nature) ruled as king over what was then (called) Akte, but now Attike, for 50 years. **He acquired this nickname** (sc. diphyes), **as Philokhoros says, either because of the length of his body, or because, being an Egyptian, he knew two languages.** This (king) gave the city the name, Athens, after (the goddess) Athena. In his time the olive-tree grew on the Acropolis for the first time. The territory got the name Kekropia from him. He was the first to sacrifice an ox and addressed Zeus by name, as some say. From him up to the first Olympiad (there were) 16 kings, 11 life-archons, (for a period of) 700 years.

8. Philokhoros F94 = Strabo 9.1.20 C397: **Because Philokhoros says that, when the territory** (sc. of Attika) **was being laid waste by the Karians from the sea and by the Boiotians, whom they used to call Aones, from the land, Kekrops was the first to form the people together into twelve communities, the names of which were: Kekropia, Tetrapolis, <Tetrakomoi>, Epakria, Dekeleia, Eleusis, Aphidna** (they use also the plural form, Aphidnai), Thorikos, Brauron, Kytheros, Sphettos, Kephisia. Theseus is said later to have brought the twelve back together again into one.

9. Philokhoros F95 = Schol. to Pindar, *Olympian* 9.45 (Snell). Pindar, *Olympian* 9.44–5: ‘...but without lying together they (i.e. Deukalion and Pyrrha) established a stone generation of like race to themselves, and they were called “laoi”’. Scholion: Epikharmos says

that they were called 'laoi' (people) after the 'laoi' (stones) of the stones. **But Philokhoros** (says the saying derived) **from Kekrops**. **For when he was desiring to make the race of the Athenians be increased in number, he bade them take up stones and bring them to a central place. And from these stones he reckoned them to be 20,000. Therefore, he says, that it was from Kekrops that the masses got the name <'laoi'>.**

10. Philokhoros F96 = Herakleides (Lembos), *Epitome* of Hermippos *On Lawgivers* in *P. Oxy.* 1367, fr. 1, col. 1.40–col. 2.8 (Hermippos, *FGrHist*: 1026 F3): They say that Kekrops, the double-formed/double-natured and earth-born was the first *to make laws* for the [Ath]enians, *when he was their king*. Amongst his *laws* the [...] were in great repute. **But [Phi]lokhoros [...]** (col. 2) [there is a lacuna of 28 lines] ...that Bouzyges *was a lawgiver*. Mention of *him* is made by the poet Lasos also.

11. Philokhoros F97 = Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.10.22: **Philochorus says that Cecrops was the first to set up an altar to Saturn (Kronos) and Ops (Rhea) in Attica; that he worshipped those gods before/in place of/in front of Jupiter (Zeus) and Terra (Ge) and that he instituted the practice that, after the produce had been brought in from the fields and the trees, heads of families everywhere should dine with their slaves, with whom they had undergone the travail of labour in cultivating the countryside: for the god takes pleasure in respect for slaves and regard for hard work.**

12. Philokhoros F98 = *P. Oxy.* 1241, col. 5.6: **Philokhoros says that making of arms first took place in the time of Kekrops, a spear and the protection of a wild animal's hide. But later, once they began to sacrifice oxen, people in Attika made their shields of ox-hide.**

Commentary

Unfortunately we do not have any fragments from earlier Atthidographers about Kekrops before these statements from Philokhoros, but, as mentioned above, there is no reason to believe that most of his predecessors did not hold much the same view. Following his selection by Kleisthenes as the eponym of one of the new ten tribes, Kekrops had already become an important figure in Athenian artistic and literary tradition by at least the mid-fifth century (see under #7 in [Appendix 2](#)), though he had not been elevated to the position of ‘first king’ by the time of Herodotos (c.430), who appears to give priority to Kranaos (8.44.2). By the time of Thucydides (2.15.1), however, the situation had changed and Kekrops had become the first ruler and primitive founder of Athenian civilization and society. It was surely Hellanikos, whose work was published in the interval, who was responsible for the transformation.

Kekrops’ role was not only political, but also related to cult and religion. The most important event associated with his reign (the contest of Poseidon and Athena for Attika), one of the founding myths of the *polis*, is not referred to by any of the surviving fragments of the Atthidographers, but can hardly have been neglected by them. For that story see Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.1. Kekrops was believed to have had a son, Erysikhthon (see later section in this chapter). He also had three daughters, with whom he was represented in fifth-century vase painting as being present at the birth of Erikhthonios, the earth-born child of Hephaistos’ lust for Athena. That story certainly was known to the Atthidographers (see below in the section on Kekrops’ daughters). He had strong associations with the oldest monuments on the Acropolis. Indeed, he may well have been an inheritance from pre-Greek religion, if speculation about his name is correct (Kron 1976:86 and n. 385). Not only that, but his form (half-snake) suggests an origin in chthonic worship (Kearns 1989:111). He was the subject of cult-worship in the Erekhtheion. What was believed to be his tomb lies under the north porch and the east wing of the fifth-century building. The priesthood of his cult on the Acropolis belonged to the *genos* of the Amynandridai (Kearns 1989:66, 173–4). This suggests that his cult at least antedated the reforms of Kleisthenes (Parker 1996:285–6), though it was probably much earlier.

Against this background it is interesting to see what has become of Kekrops by Philokhoros’ time. From the hybrid monster of myth he

has been rationalized into a human (#7 = F93) and his reign has been fitted into a frankly theoretical view of the evolution of human civilization that was no doubt influenced by Thucydides' *Archaiologia* and late fifth- and fourth-century philosophical theory. As was seen from 4a and 4b, Philokhoros probably subscribed to the Protagorean thesis that transition from the nomadic to the settled state was achieved by the establishment of towns, which were the centres of civilized life. Primitive towns needed primitive rulers and Kekrops was made to perform that function well: he established the first communities, but did not bring about the political unification of Attika (*synoikismos*), which had been reserved for Theseus since at least the time of Kimon (479–462) and probably as early as Kleisthenes; he held a primitive census of his people and probably set up some laws (#10 = F96, though what Philokhoros is saying in that fragment is not at all clear); he introduced the worship of agrarian pre-Greek gods (Kronos and Rhea); and he armed his people with weapons of hide, though not from the domesticated ox. See further in [Appendix 2](#).

Pelasgians

13. Hellanikos, *Phoronis* (FGrHist: 4 F4) = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 1.28.3: And Hellanikos of Lesbos says that the Tyrrhenians were previously called Pelasgians, but took on the name they now have when they settled in Italy. This is the account he gives in the *Phoronis*. **Phrastor was the son of Pelasgos, their king, and Menippe, daughter of Peneios; Amyntor was the son of Phrastor, Teutamides was the son of Amyntor and Nanas was the son of Teutamides. During this man's reign the Pelasgians were expelled by the Hellenes and, after abandoning their ships at the river Spinis in the Ionic gulf, they captured the city of Kroton in the interior. Using that as a base they settled (the land) that is now called Tyrsenia.** (4) But Myrsilos (FGrHist: 477 F9) gives an account that contradicts Hellanikos; he says that, after the Tyrrhenians left their own territory, their name got changed in their wandering to Pelargians, because they were likened to those birds that are called storks (pelargi), since they landed in Greece and the land of the barbarian in flocks. And it was these who put the wall, called the Pelargikon, around the acropolis for the Athenians.

14. Kleidemos F16 = *Synagoge Lex.* 419.27 s.v. APEDON: The flat and the level. Thucydides (at 7.78.4). The flat parts. **Kleidemos: And they levelled the Acropolis, and set around (it) the Pelargikon with nine gates.**

15. Philokhoros F99 = Servius Danielis on Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.600. Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.600–2: 'The story goes that the ancient Pelasgians, who were the first men to occupy the borders of Latium some time ago, dedicated a grove and a festival day to Silvanus, god of fields and flocks'. Servius: *Pelasgians*: Concerning these there are different opinions. For, some people say they trace their origin from the Athenians, others from the Laconians, others from the Thessalians; that (last) is the more impressive (suggestion), for it is agreed that there are many communities of Pelasgians in Thessaly. They are said to have been the first men to occupy Italy. **Philocorus says that they were named Pelasgians for the reason that they seemed to arrive on wings and in the spring time, like birds.** Hyginus says those who are Tyrrhenians are Pelasgians; even Varro mentions that.

16. Philokhoros F100 = Scholion to Lucian, *Kataplous* 25 p. 52.12 R: (The word) tyrant (turannos) is derived from the Tyrrhenians,

who were originally violent pirates, as Philokhoros says. For the Tyrrhenians, after living in Athens for a short time, were perceived as rising in revolt against the city. And, while many of them were killed by the Athenians, some got away and settled in Lemnos and Imbros. Some time later, since for the above reason they were inimically disposed towards the Athenians, they took to their ships and, after putting in at Brauron in Attika, carried off some maidens, who were serving the Brauronians as ‘arktoi’ in the procession for the goddess, and made them their wives.

17. Philokhoros F101 = Scholion BT to Homer, *Iliad* 1.594.

Homer, *Iliad* 1. 592–4: ‘For the whole day I (sc. Hephaistos) dropped, but at the time of the setting of the sun I landed on Lemnos, and there was little life in me. There, right away after my fall, Sintian men took care of me’. Scholion: *Sintian men*: **Philokhoros says that, because they were Pelasgians, they were addressed in this way, since they (sc. the Pelasgians) had sailed to Brauron and seized maidens bearing baskets. And (the verb) SINESTHAI (‘to plunder, pillage’) means ‘to do harm’.** But Eratosthenes (*FGrHist*: 241 F41) (says they were called Sintians), because they were sorcerers and had invented noxious drugs. And Porphorios (says they were called Sintians), because they were the first to fabricate weapons of war, which contribute (SUNTELEI) to the harming of mankind; or because they were the first to invent piracy.

18. The authors of the *Atthides* (FGrHist: 329 F1) = Strabo 5.2.4 C221: And the authors of the *Atthis* record about the Pelasgians that they were also at Athens. But, on account of their being nomadic and the fact that they visited the places they went to in a birdlike manner, they were called Pelargi (‘storks’) by the men of Attika.

Commentary

This is not the place to discuss the whole thorny issue of the Pelasgians. The most detailed ancient account of their origins and wanderings is given by Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 1.17–30. Whatever their historical reality might or might not be, they were frequently represented in Greek myths from Homer onward, often in quite contradictory ways, sometimes as barbarians, sometimes as Greek, at times indigenous pre-Greeks, at other times intruders from outside. Often, these different representations reflected the attempts of local communities to express their own ethnic identity through their relationship, or not, to them (Sourvinou-Inwood 2003:107–21). If we can talk in any sense of a general view held about them by the Greeks, it was that they were one of the many pre-Greek inhabitants of mainland Greece, a list of whom can be found in Strabo (7.7.1 C321). This list is attributed to the early Ionian historian, Hekataios (*FGrHist*: 1 F119), and shows signs of thoughtful research.

Herodotos (1.56–8), by contrast, famously complicates the matter by singling the Pelasgians out as the most important of the barbarian tribes (though cf. Thucydides 1.3) and setting them beside the Hellenes as one of the two founding peoples of Greece. He then proceeds to assign the Doric speaking Greeks to the Hellenic branch and the Attic-Ionic to the Pelasgian, thus making the Athenians originally into barbarians. His explanation (1.57.3) that the Athenians must have changed their language when they became part of the Hellenic people (how this evolved is briefly laid out at 8. 44) was hardly likely to be attractive to an Athenian audience, and his distinction that the Pelasgians were ‘original’ inhabitants, while the Hellenes were immigrants (1.56.2), was at odds with the Athenian claim to autochthony (unless, that is, the Athenians accepted that they were once Pelasgians). Anyway, he confuses both himself and his readers in the same passage (1.57.2), when he refers to Pelasgians from Plakie and Skylake in the Hellespont as people who went to live *with* the Athenians. Nevertheless, this seemingly conflicting view (for a good presentation of Herodotos’ inconsistent statements about the Pelasgians see *HCT*: 1.94–8, but, in contrast, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2003:121–31, for whom his inconsistency is a ‘strategy of deconstruction’) of the relationship of Athenians to Pelasgians does lead us to the *Athenian* story, which is what we find represented by these fragments from the Atthidographers. These fragments are

assigned by Jacoby not to the period before the kings, but to the reign of Kekrops, the first king, for the good reason that they assume the existence of a community of Athenians on the site of Athens, the establishment of which was considered by the *Atthis* to have been one of that king's achievements.

The fullest account of what the Athenians said about the Pelasgians is found in Herodotos (6.137–40). It is far enough removed from his earlier report (1.56–8) that one could excuse him for overlooking the contradictions and anomalies between the two (posited by Jacoby, *Text*: 407–10), unless they were more apparent than real (Sourvinou-Inwood 2003:132–40). What we can see is that the account he presents combines into a coherent narrative two separate Athenian stories, one about the people (Pelasgians) who had built a wall around the acropolis and had later been expelled by the Athenians, the other about Miltiades' capture of Lemnos from the Pelasgians about 500 BC. Whether Herodotos was responsible for the combination, as Jacoby has argued (*Text*: 407–10), or found it already created, is contested, though I would not be surprised if the whole story was part of the Philaid-family defence put out at the time of Miltiades' trial for tyranny (Hdt: 6.104), maybe via the intermediation of the family friend, Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3; cf. Thomas 1989:161–95). Undoubtedly, however, there did exist one other version of the first story before Herodotos, because he attributes it to his predecessor, Hekataios. This version was hardly favourable to the Athenians, since it accused them of bad faith and greed for expelling the Pelasgians from land in Athens that had been granted to them in return for building a wall around the acropolis, called, surely, the Pelasgikon (*HCT*: 2.65).

This story is overlaid and corrected in Herodotos by the 'Athenian' account, which claims that the Pelasgians deserved the treatment they received, because they had done violence to Athenian youths and plotted to attack the city. As punishment the Athenians had driven the Pelasgians out, though they denied killing any. The expelled Pelasgians, on this account, had withdrawn to Lemnos and areas nearby. The Athenian story then continues, recounting how these violent and vengeful barbarians repeated their sacrilege by sailing from Lemnos and descending upon Brauron, whence they carried off some young maidens, who were taking part in the festival to Artemis. These women, and the sons they had by their abductors, were later murdered by the Lemnians, an act that eventually justified the Athenian capture of Lemnos and a repeat expulsion of the Pelasgians by Miltiades many years later.

There is one further complicating factor. In addition to having given the name, Pelasgikon, to the remains of the Bronze Age (Mykenaian)

wall on the acropolis, probably to signify that it was ‘old’, the Athenians had a sacred area of consecrated land, situated somewhere below the acropolis, that was called the Pelargikon, ‘storky place’ (Thucydides: 2.17.1, with Gomme’s commentary, *HCT*: 2.63–5; cf. *IG*, I³: 78.54–59). Already by the time of Aristophanes (*Birds*: 832, with Dunbar’s note, 1995:497–8) the terms had become confused and subsequently the term ‘Pelargikon’ and its possible etymological association with storks (‘pelargos’ is Greek for ‘stork’) was transferred to the Mykenaian wall (cf. Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 19.5, with Rhodes, *Commentary*: 238–9) and, by extension, led to the attribution of birdlike qualities to the Pelasgians. The confusion complicated the subsequent scholarly tradition (as is apparent from the manuscript traditions of the authors mentioned) and has confounded generations of modern scholars (e.g. Travlos 1971, in whose Athens ‘pelargic’ walls abound). When and how the contamination occurred cannot be recovered. It would be tempting to attribute the pun to the wit of the great comedian in 415 BC, except that two fourteenth-century manuscripts (VU) of Herodotos attest the spelling ‘Pelargikon’ at 5.64 (against the rest of the mss tradition), which has suggested to some (e.g. Hude in his Oxford edition of Herodotos) that he might have used the name Pelargikon for the acropolis wall as early as 430 BC. At any rate, the passage from Aristophanes shows that the idea was earlier than Hellanikos and, therefore, preceded the first written *Atthis*. Nevertheless, it was undoubtedly a feature of the Athidographers’ understanding of the Pelasgians and their place in Athenian history. See further in [Appendix 3](#).

The daughters of Kekrops and the birth of Erikhthonios

19. Hellanikos F1 = *Synagoge Lex.* 444.1; *Etymologicum Genuinum* p. 41; *Etymologicum Magnum* p. 139.8; *Souda* s.v. Areios Pagos: A lawcourt at Athens. **And it was called Areios Pagos either because the court is on high on a hill (*pagos*) and Areios, because it judges homicides and Ares is in charge of murders, or because Ares struck his spear on the ground here in his suit against Poseidon and Halirrhotos, because he had killed him for raping Alkippe, his (sc. Ares') daughter by Agraulos the daughter of Kekrops, as Hellanikos says in (book) one.**

20. Androtion F1 = *Lexikon rhetoricum Cantabrigiense*, 346.9N. Kerykes: **As Androtion in (the) first (book) of (his) *Atthis* (says), Kekrops had three daughters, Agraulos, Herse and Pandrosos. And Keryx was born of her (Pandrosos), after she had mated with Hermes.**

21. Philokhoros F10 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. *epiboion*: Lykourgos (mentions this) in the (speech) *About the Priestess*. **Philokhoros in (book) two says as follows: But if someone sacrifices an ox to Athena, he must sacrifice a sheep to Pandrosos also, and this was called the in-addition-to-the-ox (epi-boi) sacrifice.**

22. Philokhoros F105 = Scholion to Demosthenes 19 (*On the False Embassy*), 303 ('Who is the one who is...reading out the oath sworn by the ephebes in the sanctuary of Aglauros?'): **Agraulos and Herse and Pandrosos (were) the daughters of Kekrops, as Philokhoros says. And they say that when war arose amongst the Athenians, when Eumolpos took the field against Erekhtheus, and it was going on for a long time, Apollo gave out an oracular response that they would be rid of it (sc. the war), if someone sacrificed themselves for the city. Whereupon Agraulos willingly gave away her life. She threw herself from the city wall. Then, when the war was over, they set up a sanctuary to her for this deed near the *propylaia* of the city. And there the ephebes swear an oath, when they are about to go forth to battle.**

23. Philokhoros F106 = Scholion to Demosthenes 19.303: **Agraulos became a priestess of Athena, as Philokhoros says.**

24. Philokhoros F183 = *Lexikon rhetoricum*, p. 239.7, s.v.

Deipnophoros: The name of a festival. For the *deipnophoria* ('carrying of meals') is to carry meals to the daughters of Kekrops, Herse, Pandrosos and Agraulos. And meals were provided in a lavish manner, according to the mystical account. And the common people used to do this. For it brings honour. **And Philokhoros says that the mothers of the twice seven children, who had been shut up in preparation for being sent to the Minotaur, sent them a meal every day and visited them, and that after their return, *as if fulfilling a prayer, children called 'meal-bearers' carry meals in the festival.*** (NB The text between the asterisks is quite corrupt.)

25. Istros F27 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 641 ('When I was seven years of age I served as an *arrephoros*...'): Some (write) *arrephoria* with an 'a', since the maidens carry secret (*arreta*) objects in the baskets, while others (write) (h)ersephoria with an 'e'. **For they make the procession for (H)erse, daughter of Kekrops, as Istros records.**

26. Amelesagoras F1 = Antigonos of Karystos, *Mirabilia* 12: Amelesagoras the Athenian, the one who wrote the *Atthis*, says that the crow does not fly to the Acropolis (and, indeed, no one could say that he has seen one), and he explains the reason with a myth. For he says that, when Athena had been given (in marriage) to Hephaistos, after she had been put to bed with him, she disappeared, and Hephaistos fell to earth and ejaculated his sperm. Later, the earth gave back Erikhthonios in return, and Athena raised him. She shut him up in a basket and entrusted him to the daughters of Kekrops, Agraulos and Pandrosos and Herse, and enjoined upon them not to open the basket until she, herself, returned. When she reached Pellene (on her way back), carrying a mountain to set as a bastion before the Acropolis, the two daughters of Kekrops, Agraulos and Pandrosos, opened the basket and saw two snakes beside Erikhthonios. He says that a crow met Athena, on her way with the mountain, which is called Lykabettos, and told her that Erikhthonios was revealed. On hearing this, she (Athena) threw the mountain to its present location and told the crow that, in return for its bad message, it would not be permitted to go onto the Acropolis.

27. Bion of Prokonnesos (FGrHist: 332) F1 = Photios, s.v. *Aglauros*: A nickname of Athena. Also, one of the daughters of Kekrops, whom women hold in honour and swear by. For, to the honour of her father, Kekrops, the goddess allotted some privilege to Agraulos. So (says) Bion of Prokonnesos.

Commentary

The myth of the birth of Erikhthonios ('the very earth-born') is attested first in Attic vase painting from about 470 BC (Kron 1976:92–3). This fact, together with the essential details of the story, is alluded to by Euripides in the *Ion* (vv. 268–74) in the penultimate decade of the fifth century. The fullest version is found in Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.14.6). *Hephaistos made lustful advances towards Athena, who fled in virgin panic. He ejaculated his sperm prematurely upon her thigh. In disgust she wiped it off with a piece of wool and threw it to the earth. From the fertilized earth arose Erikhthonios (or Erekhtheus, with whom he is often confused). Athena hid the infant in a basket (kiste) and entrusted him to Pandrosos, daughter of Kekrops, with instruction not to open the basket. Pandrosos did not, but her two sisters, Aglauros and Herse, did (but note the variant version in Amelesagoras, FGrHist: 330 F1 = #26, in which it is Agraulos and Pandrosos who open the basket). For their crime (or because of what they saw, which is variously depicted as Erikhthonios surrounded by snakes or himself in the form of a snake) they were driven mad and threw themselves off the Acropolis to their deaths.* The myth is really part of the story of Erikhthonios, who became the fourth king of Athens, but has to be outlined here because of the connection to Kekrops.

The involvement of Kekrops and the daughters attributed to him with the story of Erikhthonios occasioned some difficulties for the Atthidographers when they were trying to arrange several independent *autochthons* (Kekrops, Erikhthonios, Erekhtheus and Kranaos) into an orderly sequence, difficulties that were not comfortably resolved. In the first place, since Hellanikos had elevated Kekrops to 'first king' and demoted Kranaos to the role of second, a greater gap existed between the reigns of Kekrops and Erikhthonios than would have been the case if Kekrops had remained where he was in Herodotos' scheme (8.44.2). We do not know whether the Atthidographers felt the need to explain how the first king and his daughters could have been present at the birth of the fourth, but we can see that the chronographers dealt with the problem by assigning both Kranaos and his successor, Amphiktyon, very short reigns, totalling only 19 years between them. A bigger discrepancy was caused by one of the daughters, Agraulos/Aglauros, who was associated in another story with Erekhtheus, the sixth king of Attika (#22). That problem was never satisfactorily solved

and, though the stories have variant themes, they form a doublet and she ends up throwing herself off the acropolis twice, about 100 years apart. See further in [Appendix 4](#).

Erysikhthon

28. Phanodemos F2 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 9.47 p. 392D:
Concerning their birth (sc. of quails) **Phanodemos in (the) second (book) of *Atthis* says: When Erysikhthon beheld the island of Delos, which was called Ortygia (i.e. quail island) by the ancients as a result of the fact that flocks of these creatures (sc. quails), carried in from the open sea, settle on the island because of its having good places to rest.**

Commentary

We can be fairly certain that Erysikhthon was a ‘real’ hero, because he was the eponym (though not progenitor, see Kearns 1989:66) of a known Athenian *genos*, the Erysikhthonidai, which had cult associations with the worship of Apollo on the island of Delos (Kearns 1989:78; Lambert 1993:212). The *genos* may have lived at Prasiai (Portoraphti) in Attika, since Pausanias (1.31.2) records that there was a memorial to Erysikhthon there. According to his account, Erysikhthon died at sea on his way back from Delos and his body was brought to land at Prasiai. There was also a shrine of Apollo there, from which the Athenian *theoria* (sacred embassy) to Delos set out (Pausanias: 1.31.2). His connection with Prasiai and the worship of Apollo is strong, therefore, as is his association with Delos. Eusebios (Hieronymus) even records that he built the temple of Apollo on Delos in the forty-sixth year of Kekrops’ reign. Another reference claims that he brought to Athens from Delos the oldest cult statue of Eileithyia, the goddess of childbirth, who gave assistance to Leto in her labour (Pausanias: 1.18.5).

Beyond that, the tradition has little to say about this hero. It is remembered of him that he was a son of Kekrops and his wife, Agraulos, the daughter of Aktaios (on whom see above), but that he never became king of Athens, because he died without producing any children (Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.2; see also Pausanias: 1.2.6). The form of his name (*erysi-khthon*), a compound of the word *-khthon* (‘land’, ‘earth’), supports the idea that he was an early hero (cf. *Eri-khthon-ios*). Etymologically, it could either mean ‘defender of the land’ (cf. *Erysi-ptolis*, ‘defender of the city’, an epithet of Athena in Homer, *Iliad*: 6.305) or ‘tearer up of the land’. The latter meaning is certainly appropriate for his more famous namesake, Erysikhthon, son of Triopas, of Thessaly, whose wretched fate became the subject of a famous poem by Kallimakhos (*Hymn* 6, *To Demeter*; see also Ovid, *Metamorphoses*: 8.738–884). See further in [Appendix 5](#).

Kranaos

(1506/5–1497/6 Kastor)

MP, epoch 3 (1531/0 = 1506/5 Kastor): From the time when the lawsuit between Ares and Poseidon took place at Athens over Halirrhothios, son of Poseidon, and the place got the name Areios pagos, 1268 years, when Kr[ana]os was king of Athens.

***MP*, epoch 4 (1528/7 = 1503/2 Kastor): From the time when the flood happened in Deukalion's day, and Deukalion fled the rains, (moving) from Lykoreia to Athens to (take refuge with) [Krana]os, and *founded* the sanctuary of O[ly]m[pian] Zeu[s and] made sacrifice for his escape to safety, 1265 years, when Kr[a]n[a]os was king of Athens.**

Commentary

We do not have any fragment from an *Atthis* specifically relating to the reign of Kranaos ('man of the heights'), but from the other source-material we can piece together some points of the Atthidographic tradition about him. The first is that the Atthidographers consistently presented him as the second king of Athens, after Kekrops, probably from the *Atthis* of Hellanikos onward. As was stated above, this is in direct opposition to the view espoused by Herodotos (8.44), according to which the Athenians had been called Kranaoi ('men of the heights') during the time when they were Pelasgians, and had only changed their name to Kekropidai in the reign of Kekrops. Indeed, there is plenty of evidence that an early epithet for Athens was 'kranaai' ('rocky', 'steep'), because of the Acropolis, and it is rather a chicken and egg question to ask whether Kranaos was named after the adjective, or *vice versa*. Pindar used the phrase ('kranaai Athenai') as a standard way of referring to the city (*Olympian*: 7.82; 13.38; *Nemean*: 8.11) and the adjective appears three times in Aristophanes in either singular (*Akharnians*: 75; *Lysistrata*: 481) or plural (*Birds*: 123), signifying the city or the Acropolis. Finally, Aiskhylos has Athena address the Athenians as 'children of Kranaos' in the *Eumenides* (v.1011). All these works preceded the publication of Thucydides' history, in which Kekrops has already become first king (2.15.1). Surely, Hellanikos' *Atthis*, which was published in the meantime, was responsible for the change. Why Hellanikos should have chosen to depart from the existing tradition is unclear, but Kekrops had no doubt been gaining in significance ever since the time of Kleisthenes, when he had been chosen to be eponym of one of the ten tribes, and even Herodotos accepted that the Athenians had once been called Kekropidai. In fact, one might guess that the change had something to do with the explanation of the etymology of the name Attike.

Jacoby (*Text*: 397–99) has a good analysis of the various theories put forward by the ancient sources regarding the names given to the Athenians and their territory. For Herodotos (8.44), who was only concerned with the people, the progression was: Kranaoi (after Kranaos), Kekropidai (after Kekrops), Athenaioi (under Erekhtheus), Iones (Ionians, after Ion). The later authors (*MP*, Pausanias and Strabo), by contrast, are more concerned with the name of the territory. The *Marmor Parium* (epoch 1, 2) offers Aktike (after

Aktaios) and Kekropia (after Kekrops), and only mentions that the people began to be called Athenians in the time of Erikhthonios (epoch 10). Pausanias (1.2.6) and Strabo (9.1.18) agree in essence with *MP* that the original name for Attika was associated with the concept of Akte ('promontory'), naming it either Aktaia (Pausanias) or Aktike (Strabo) and deriving the name from an obviously invented eponym, Aktaios (Pausanias) or Aktaion (Strabo). Both, however, attribute the change from Aktike to Attike to the name of Atthis, daughter of Kranaos.

Atthis, no less than Aktaios, was obviously invented for etymological purposes (i.e. to explain a name). She has no personality, nor is there an extended narrative about her. There is not even agreement in our sources on what little we are told about her. The fullest account is given by Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.14.5). There we find she was one of three daughters born to Kranaos by his Lakedaimonian wife, Pedias, daughter of Mynes. The other two were Kranae and Kranaekhme. These details were blatantly designed to create the semblance of reality. None of these people are heard of elsewhere. Atthis, herself, conveniently died a virgin in Apollodoros' account, whereupon Kranaos named Attika after her.

The only other account to offer any detail is that of Pausanias, who claims that Atthis married Amphiktyon, the man who threw out Kranaos (see Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.6), but he does not report any children.

The only suggestion that Atthis had any offspring is the mention made by Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.14.6) of a view held by some unnamed source that she was the mother of Erikhthonios by Hephaistos, a view which he dismisses abruptly. Pausanias offers no reason why Attike was named after her, nor does Strabo, who has even less to say on the subject ('They say that Akte was derived from Aktaion, and Atthis and Attike from Atthis, the daughter of Kranaos, after whom the inhabitants were called Kranaoi'). The only point they all agree on is the connection between her name and Attike.

In reality, when the word 'Atthis' first appeared in the late fifth century in the plays of Euripides (*Ion*: 13; *Iphigeneia in Aulis*: 247–8; *Iphigeneia in Tauris*: 1450; *Phoenissai*: 1706), it was not as a woman but an adjective, usually modifying the word 'ge' (land) and meaning 'Attike land' (cf. Jacoby, *Atthis*: 79–86). Who first turned it into a person we cannot be sure, but it was probably one of the Atthidographers (though maybe not Hellanikos, see Thucydides: 1.97.2), since we cannot forget that Atthis also provided the name for the genre. In any event, it stands to reason that the consequence of making her the last and definitive etymological source of the name

Attike meant that her father had to follow Kekrops, in whose time the region had been called Kekropia.

Otherwise, the tradition records about Kranaos that he was an *autochthon*; that he reigned for only a short time (the chronographers allot him 9 years); that he provided refuge to Deukalion from the flood; witnessed the first trial on the Areiopagos; and finally that he was expelled by Amphiktyon and took refuge in the deme of Lamptrai, southeast of Hymettos, where his memorial was still to be seen in Pausanias' time (1.30.2). On the topic of the Areiopagos we do have some relevant fragments.

2

AREIOPAGOS TO AIGEUS

The Areiopagos

MP, epoch 3 (1531/0 = 1506/5 Kastor): From the time when the lawsuit between Ares and Poseidon took place at Athens over Halirrthothios, son of Poseidon, and the place got the name Areios pagos, 1268 years, when Kr[ana]os was king of Athens.

MP, epoch 25 (1208/7? = 1183/2 Kastor): From the time when [the trial was held] on the Areios pagos for Orestes, [the ?], and the daughter of Aigisthos, [Erig]on[e], over [Ai]gisthos and [Kl]y[taimnestra], (the trial) which Orestes won, [when the votes turned out to be even], 944 (?) years, when Demophon was king of Athens.

29. (Cf. #19). Hellanikos F1 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F38) = *Synagoge Lex.* 444; *Etymologicum Genuinum* p. 41; *Etymologicum Magnum* p. 139.8; *Souda* s.v. Areios Pagos: A lawcourt at Athens. **And it was called Areios Pagos either because the court is on high on a hill (*pagos*) and Areios, because it judges homicides and Ares is in charge of murders, or because Ares struck his spear on the ground here in his suit against Poseidon and Halirrthotios, because he had killed him for raping Alkippe, his (sc. Ares') daughter by Agraulos the daughter of Kekrops, as Hellanikos says in (book) one.**

30a. Hellanikos F22a (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F169) = Scholion to Euripides, *Orestes* 1648 ('Thence, having gone to the city of the Athenians, undergo trial by the three Eumenides for murdering your mother, and when the gods as judges of your case on the Areios pagos divide their most holy ballot, it is right for you to be victorious there'): Concerning the trial of Orestes in the Areios pagos Hellanikos also gives an account, writing as follows: **To the delegation from Lakedaimon and to Orestes the Athenians ... (lacuna) gave counsel. Eventually, when both sides approved, the Athenians set the trial in process. And the lawsuit of Klytaimnestra, daughter of Tyndareus, the one who killed Agamemnon, regarding Orestes took place nine generations after the trial for Ares and Poseidon over Halirrthothios, six generations after the (trial) of Kephalos, son of Deioneus, who, having taken Prokris, daughter of Erekhtheus, to wife and having killed her, (after pleading) his case, was sent into exile by the Areiopagos, and three generations after the trial of Daidalos, who was condemned to exile for having encompassed by cunning the death of his nephew, Talos, who was**

competing (with him) in skill.

30b. Hellanikos F22b (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F169) = Scholion to Euripides, *Orestes* 1651 ('On the Areios pagoi'): **The first to contest their case there were Ares and Poseidon, the second, three generations later, (was) Kephalos, son of Deioneus, over his wife Prokris, and three generations later, Daidalos over his nephew, Talos, and (again) after three (generations), Orestes, as Hellanikos (says).**

31. Philokhoros F3 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Areios pagos: A hill at Athens, as Apollodoros (says) in (book) 9 of *On the Gods* (*FGrHist*: 244 F94), on which they judged homicide cases because of the slaughters that result from iron. **Philokhoros in the second book of *Atthis* (says) that Halirrhothios, son of Poseidon, was killed by Ares, because he raped Alkippe, his (sc. Ares') daughter.**

32. Androtion F3/Philokhoros F4 and F20a = Maximus the Confessor, *Prologue to a Commentary on Ps.-Dionysios the Areopagite*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* iv.17: The court on Areios Pagos was outside the city, (and was) so named (according to the Athenians' story) from the court set up between Poseidon and Ares on that very prominence of the hill opposite the city. For, according to the old stories amongst the Athenians, it was in this place that Poseidon pleaded his case against Ares, arguing that his own son Halirrhothios had been killed by Ares. And thence the hill (*pagos*) was called Areios after Ares. **So the Areiopagites used to pass judgement on almost all failings and transgressions, as Androtion says throughout in the first, and Philokhoros in the second and third (books) of the *Atthides*.**

33a. Androtion F4a and Philokhoros F20b = Maximus the Confessor, *Prologue to a Commentary on Ps.-Dionysios the Areopagite*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* iv.16: It is necessary to understand, as I have previously said, that it was not in everyone's ability to belong to the Council of the Areiopagos, but those amongst the Athenians who were leaders in birth and wealth and usefulness of life; and those who were distinguished in this way used to serve as councillors in the Council of the Areiopagos. **For it was from the nine existing archons at Athens that it was necessary to constitute the Areiopagites as judges, as Androtion says in the second (book) of the *Atthis*. (Philokhoros F20b). Later, the Council of the Areiopagos was made up of more (men), that is, the (Council) of fifty-one (composed) of distinguished men, only from the Eupatrids, as we said, from men distinguished both by wealth and by their moderate way of life, as Philokhoros records in the course of the third (book) of the same *Atthides*.**

33b. Androtion F4b/Philokhoros F20c = Michael Synkellos, *Enkomion on Ps.-Dionysios the Areopagite*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* iv.620: He made mention of the judges on the Areios pagos... **whose glorious and famous birth has been recorded extensively by the writers of the *Atthides*, both Androtion and Philokhoros.**

34. Phanodemos F10/Philokhoros F196 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 4.65 p. 168A: **Phanodemos and Philokhoros and many others have recorded that in the olden days the Areiopagites used to summon before them the profligate and all those who could barely make ends meet and they used to punish them.**

35. Istros F14 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. 'Bring a spear to the funeral and make a proclamation at the tomb': Demosthenes (47.69)... says this over someone who has died a violent death. **And Istros in his *Synagoge of the Atthides*, speaking about Kephalos and Prokris, writes as follows: And some say that Erekhtheus fixed his spear down on the tomb (sc. of Prokris) (and) that he did this both * depositing and signifying his suffering, on account of the fact that it was lawful for relatives to pursue murderers in this fashion.**

Commentary

These are all the surviving fragments from the Atthidographers on the early history, composition and competence of the important Athenian institution of the Areiopagos. I have treated these issues elsewhere (*Androton*: 84–90). As I said there (85), these fragments are important for discussion of all the questions that are raised by ancient and modern scholars (see the review in Wallace 1985: *passim*) about the Areiopagos, namely, whether it existed before Solon, who could be a member of it and how they were chosen, and whether it had a political role as well as a judicial one. While these fragments do not provide a solution to any of these historical problems, they do make quite clear what the Atthidographers (unanimously, it seems) said on the issues and thus clarify the historiographical relationship between the *Atthis* and the other authoritative source on the Areiopagos, Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*.

In brief, it is sufficient to say here that it appears that the Atthidographers all accepted the literary and mythical tradition that the Areiopagos was almost as old as the monarchy itself (Wallace 1985:87–93, 219–28) and thus were in agreement with Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia* 3.6, 8.2, 8.4; see also Rhodes, *Commentary*: *ad loc.*) and Plutarch (*Solon*: 19.3–5) that it existed in some form before Solon. Unlike Aristotle, however, who assigned to the early Areiopagos virtual constitutional control of the government (*Athenaion Politeia*: 3.6, 8.2), the Atthidographers treated it solely as a court of law. Though the mythical accounts they adopt show that they traced its foundation to an original competence over homicide trials, at least Androton (#32), Phanodemos (#34) and Philokhoros (#32, #34) believed it had (or acquired) competence over other transgressions as well (*pace* Wallace 1985:189). Finally, whilst it is not entirely clear how they believed its membership was constituted, there are indications that Philokhoros, at least, and probably also Androton, envisaged a degree of evolution in its composition, against Aristotle's rather monolithic view that it was made up of all ex-archons, who sat on the council for life (*Athenaion Politeia*: 3.6). The basis for these summary statements will be explored in the discussion of the individual fragments in [Appendix 6](#).

Amphiktyon

Kastor, 1497/6–1487/6: Amphiktyon, son of Deukalion, son-in-law of Kranaos, under whom the history of the Danaids is narrated, (ruled) 9 years.

MP, epoch 5 (1521/0): From the time when Amphiktyon, son of Deukalion, became king at Thermopylai and gathered together the peoples living around the temple and gave the names Amphiktyons and P[ylaia], where indeed even now the Amphiktyons still sacrifice, 1258 years, when Amphiktyon was king at Athens.

MP, epoch 6 (1520/19): From the time when Hellen, son of Deukalion, became king of Phthiotis and Hellenes got their name (previously being called Graikoi), and [...], 1257 years, when Amphiktyon was king at Athens.

MP, epoch 7 (1518/17): From the time when Kadmos, son of Agenor, arrived at Thebes ** [and] founded the Kadmeia, 1255 years, when Amphiktyon was king at Athens.

MP, epoch 8 (1515/14): From the time when [Kilix and Phoinix, sons of Agenor,] became kings (respectively) [of Kilikia and Phoi]nikia, 1252 years, when Amphiktyon was king at Athens.

Georgios Synkellos (Eusebios), *Ekloge Chronographias* (Mosshammer) 297.14: Amphiktyon was the third to rule over the Athenians; (he ruled) for 10 years. (He was) son of Deukalion, brother-in-law of Kranaos. Anno mundi 4004. During the time of Amphiktyon, son of Deukalion, some say that Dionysos came to Attike and was hospitably entertained by Semakhos and gave his (sc. Semakhos') daughter his fawnskin. This (Dionysos) was other than the son of Semele.

36. Androton F58 = Pausanias 10.8.1: Some writers believe that Amphiktyon, the son of Deukalion, established an assembly of Greeks here (Delphi) and the delegates were called 'Amphiktyons' after him. But Androton in his *Atthis* history said that originally the people who assembled at Delphi came from those who lived in the vicinity and that those who assembled were called 'dwellers around' (amphiktions), but that in time their present name won out.

37a. Philokhoros F5a = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 15.48 p. 693d–e: And Philokhoros in the second (book) of *Atthis* says: **And he laid**

down a regulation at that time that after food there should be proffered to everyone some unmixed (wine), enough for a taste and a demonstration of the power of the Good God; otherwise for the rest (they should be offered wine) that was already mixed (sc. with water). Wherefore, the Nymphs are also called nurses of Dionysos. (Cf. Phanodemos F12, #277.)

37b. Philokhoros F5b = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 2.7 p. 38c-d: And Philokhoros says: Amphiktyon, the king of Athens, having learned from Dionysos the practice of mixing wine (sc. with water), was the first to do so. Wherefore, people who drink this way have become upright (orthoi), where previously they were bent over on account of unadulterated (wine). And for this reason he set up an altar of Upright Dionysos in the sanctuary of the Horai (Seasons). For these nourish also the fruit of the vine. And nearby it (sc. the altar to Dionysos) he built also an altar to the Nymphs, intending it as a reminder of (the power of) unmixed (wine) for those who use (it). For the Nymphs are called also the nurses of Dionysos. And he laid down a regulation that after food there should be proffered <to everyone> unmixed wine, only enough for tasting, as a demonstration of the power of the Good God, but for the rest (they should be offered wine) already mixed (sc. with water), as much as each person wanted. And he mentions also in addition to this the name of Zeus the Saviour to help the recollection and understanding of those who drink, because when they drink this way (i.e. watered wine) they will survive safely. (Cf. Phanodemos F12, #277.)

38. Philokhoros F206 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Semakhidai: A deme in Attika (named) after Semakhos. Dionysos was entertained hospitably by him and his daughters, from whom his (i.e. Dionysos') priestesses (are chosen). (The deme) is part of the tribe Antiokhis. **And Philokhoros says the deme is part of Epakria.**

Commentary

There are two separate traditions about a person called Amphiktyon. One is Panhellenic in scope and concerns a son of Deukalion, who was assigned the role of eponym of the Amphiktyonic League that was based at Anthela, near Thermopylai (besides the sources quoted above see Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. *Amphiktyones* and the scholion to Euripides, *Orestes*: 1094). The other is local and Athenian. It relates to the third king of the city, who was situated in the king-list between Kranaos and Erikhthonios at approximately the same date as the subject of the first tradition. The first is, of course, an invention typical of Greek mythology, designed to explain a name. The second may be just as fictitious. It certainly is, if the two individuals are identical, as was normally assumed in our sources and has been maintained, at least for the Atthidographers, by Jacoby (*Text*: 164; *Notes*: 146). On the other hand the Athenian Amphiktyon, whilst in no way ‘historical’, may have had an independent origin. The case deserves review.

The case for believing that the two were identified is strong. The majority of our later sources call Amphiktyon, the king of Athens, a son of Deukalion. Since *MP* (at epoch 4), probably following an Atthidographic source, brought Deukalion to Athens to take refuge from the flood, it would not be surprising to place his son there. Further, other accounts give him a relationship to Kranaos, not only Synkellos (above), who strangely makes them brothers-in-law, but Pausanias (1.2.6), who more plausibly follows a version that married him off to Atthis, daughter of Kranaos (*contra* Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.5, where Atthis died a virgin). The story then continues that, despite this relationship, he overthrew Kranaos, usurped the throne and ruled for 9, 10 or 12 years (depending on the source), until he too was expelled in his turn by Erikhthonios (Pausanias: 1.2.6; 1.30.2; Apollodoros: 3.14.6). Furthermore, in the accounts of the chronographers and later sources, Amphiktyon appears to have no independent association with Athenian cultic or political institutions; in fact he appears to be entirely a figure of Panhellenic mythology, who had been carefully fitted into the chronological scheme for pre-Trojan War events that was devised by fifth-century mythographers, in particular Hellanikos. He looks very much like an intruded character.

Additional support for this conclusion has been found in the silence about his role as king of Athens in early historians, like Herodotos,

who only refers to his association with the Amphiktyony (Hdt.: 7.200). Whether it was Hellanikos who introduced Amphiktyon into the Athenian king-list cannot be established for certain, but it is all too tempting to believe that he could not have failed to take this opportunity to tie his Attic chronological scheme into his larger Panhellenic construct, especially since the result, first the seizure of the body of the father of all Greeks (Deukalion's tomb was displayed in Athens, see Pausanias: 1.18.8; Strabo: 9.4.2 C425), then the hijacking of his son and through him the foundation of the Amphiktyonic League (Jacoby, *Text*: 164), might be thought not to have been unpalatable to fifth-century Athenian propaganda.

In fact, Hellanikos remains the most likely source for the temporal correlations in *MP* epochs 5–8 (*pace* Jacoby 1904:33–5; *Text*: 164; *Notes*: 146). Yet it is the details in *MP* that create the first doubts about the identification. As Jacoby observed, *MP* appears to treat Amphiktyon, king at Thermopylai, as different from Amphiktyon, king of Athens (see Jacoby, *Notes*: 146). Since he believed that the Atthidographers from Hellanikos onward uniformly held to the view that the two Amphiktyons were the same, Jacoby was forced to suggest that *MP* was here using a non-Atthidographic source, perhaps Ephoros. But Apollodoros confirms that there was an alternative tradition about the king, namely that he was not a son of Deukalion at all, but an *autokhthon* (*Bibliotheka*: 3.14.6). This raises the question whether the Atthidographers all spoke with one voice about the Amphiktyons. Clear evidence that they did not can be seen in the fragment from Androtion (above). He dismisses the view that Amphiktyon was eponym of the Amphiktyonic League, preferring to replace that idea with some typical rationalistic etymologizing. We do not know what he said about Amphiktyon of Athens, but he obviously could not have identified him with a person whose existence he had rationalized into oblivion. Incidentally, the fragment from Androtion also undermines any claim Athens might have had to association with the foundation of the Amphiktyonic League (see *Androtion*: 184–5). Not all Atthidographers were chauvinists.

Thus, whilst it is easy to believe that Hellanikos did attempt to correlate his Athenian king-list with his scheme for Panhellenic mythography and not impossible that in that process he introduced a son of Deukalion into his list, it is also a possibility that he (or maybe one of his successors) found an Athenian hero of the same name that provided the point of contact. That such a hero actually existed is strongly suggested by the separate, and very Athenian, tradition about the visit of Dionysos to Athens, when he taught Amphiktyon the practice of mixing wine with water (#37a-b; #277) and was hosted by Semakhos, eponymous hero of an Athenian deme and clan (#38). For

more detailed discussion of these fragments see further in [Appendix 7](#).

Erikhthonios and the Panathenaia

Kastor: Erikhthonios, son of Hephaistos, who was called Erekhtheus by Homer, <50 years> (1487/6–1437/6).

MP, epoch 10 (1505/4): From the time when Erikhthonios yoked the chariot for the Panathenaia, the first that took place, and demonstrated the contest (maybe the chariot race or, more probably, the *apobates*), and gave the Athenians their name, and [a statue] of the mother of the gods appeared in Kybeloi, and Hyagnis the Phrygian first invented the flute in [...] the Phrygians and first played on the flute the harmony the so-called Phrygian way and [...], 1242 years, when Erikhthonios, the one who yoked the chariot, was king in Athens.

39. Hellanikos F2 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F39)/Androtion F2/Istros F4 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Panathenaia: Demosthenes (uses the word) in *Philippics* (Dem. 4.35; also at 19.168). Two (festivals called) Panathenaia were celebrated at Athens, the one yearly, the other every fifth year (i.e. four years apart). And this was called the Great (Megala). Isokrates in *Panathenaikos* uses the expression ‘a little before the Great Panathenaia’ (5.17). **The festival was first celebrated by Erikhthonios, son of Hephaistos, as both Hellanikos and Androtion record, each one in the first (book) of *Atthis*. Before this (the festival) was called *Athenaia*, as is made clear by Istros in the third (book) of his *Attika*.**

40. Philokhoros F8 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Basketbearers: Lykourgos in the (speech) *Against Lykophron* (F68). Concerning the basketbearers **Philokhoros in the second (book) of *Atthis* says that the practice was first established in the reign of Erikhthonios, that the maidens of good birth carry the baskets for the goddess. On these baskets were laid the sacrificial items, both at the Panathenaia and the other processions.**

41. Philokhoros F9 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 544. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 543/4: ‘Ridiculed in the streets, we shall be called olive-shoot carriers...’. Scholion: Since in the Panathenaia the old men used to march in the procession carrying olive shoots. Dikaiarkhos (sc. of Messana), however, in his *Panathenaikos* supposed on the basis of some unknown source that old women also carried the olive at the Panathenaia, although many authorities are in agreement that only the old men did; for example, Xenophon in the

Symposion (4.17), and **Philokhoros in the second (book), who indeed portrays Erikhthonios as the one who handed down the custom.**

42. Philokhoros F102 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. euandria: Deinarkhos (uses the term) in the (speech) *Against Agasikles*. There was a contest for manliness (euandria) at the Panathenaia. Andokides shows (this) in the (speech) *Against Alkibiades* **and (so does) Philokhoros.**

Commentary

As the entry from Kastor shows, at some time in antiquity the figures of Erikhthonios and Erekhtheus became confused and equated. This has also been a characteristic of much modern discussion, where one will often find them joined as 'Erikhthonios/Erekhtheus' and treated as two versions of the same individual. Furthermore, Erikhthonios was usually assumed to be the original. But this was not the view of the Atthidographers, who all (as far as we can tell) treated them as two different characters two generations apart. The most recent discussions today also distinguish the two, but reverse the order of the *Atthis*, making Erekhtheus the original (as he surely was, since he was known to Homer, *Iliad*: 2.546–52; *Odyssey*: 7.78–81) and Erikhthonios a sixth-century clone, invented in association with the creation or embellishment of the Panathenaia in 566/5 (Pherekydes, *FGrHist*: 3 F2 for the attribution to the Philaid, Hippokleides; see Thomas 1989:161–73 and the discussion in *Androton*: 83–4). The story of his wonderful birth as Athena's child by Hephaistos' unrequited passion, as well as the involvement of the Kekropidai (recounted above), will, on this view, have been created at the same time and in the same context. Erikhthonios, whose name 'the very earth-born one' invoked the autochthony-theme (see Kearns 1989:110–19; Loraux 2000: *passim*), assumed the original divine aspect of Erekhtheus, who in turn took on a more kingly and human role, especially after he was chosen to become one of the ten eponymous heroes of Kleisthenes' new tribes. Judging from Herodotos (8.44), who only knew Erekhtheus and considered him the man who gave the Athenians their name, Erikhthonios was first admitted to the king-list by the Atthidographers, probably Hellanikos.

From the sixth century onwards Erikhthonios was treated as the founder of the Panathenaia (in addition to the passages above see Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.6), or, more specifically, in his capacity as the first to yoke the chariot, as the inventor of the chariot competitions, the earliest of which was probably the unique *apobates*, where an armed rider jumped in and out of the vehicle. His position did not, however, go unchallenged, since someone advanced the idea that Theseus should be given the credit for the Panathenaia (see Plut., *Theseus*: 24.3; Pausanias: 8.2.1; Photios, *Lexikon*: s.v. Panathenaia; Parker 1996:91–2). Whether this was a product of the later sixth century, when Theseus first became politically significant, or

sometime in the fifth is disputed (see under Theseus below), and we have no idea who transmitted this view. No extant fragment from an Atthidographer espouses this idea or offers any suggestion that their tradition was anything but unified, although the fragment from Istros, in which he maintains that there had been a festival called *Athenaia* before there was a *Panathenaia*, is usually taken to show that there was dispute about the origin of the festival which either he or his source resolved by assigning the first to Erikhthonios and the enlargement to Theseus (Pausanias 8.2.1). Since we have no fragment from Kleidemos, Phanodemos, Melanthios or Demon, we cannot say for certain that the Atthidographers were unified on this topic (see the discussion in Jacoby, *Text* 629–32).

The references to Philokhoros show that he, at least, was not only concerned with the mythical origin of the festival, but also treated the ritual, cultic and sociological aspects as well. Information in this area is also provided by Aristotle in chapter 60 of the *Athenaion Politeia* (see Davison 1958:29–33; 1962:141–2; Rhodes, *Commentary* 668–76) and by inscriptions (especially, *IG*, II²: 334, for which see Rhodes and Osborne 2003:396–402, and, in general, Tracy 1991:133–53). But although we have so much information, a great deal about the Panathenaia remains opaque (for a good overview see Parke 1977:35–50). Dispute still revolves about its origin (see, for example, the very different views of Mikalson 1976:141–53, Robertson 1985:231–295; 1992:90–119 and Burkert 1985:232–3) and even the formerly agreed upon opinion that the Parthenon frieze depicted the Panathenaic procession has now been called into question (Connelly 1996:53–80). Useful information about the Panathenaia, the most important festival of Athena, celebrated in the last week of the first month of the year, Hekatombaion, and culminating on the 28th with the *pannykhis*, the procession, the gift of the *peplos* and the main sacrifices, can be found in Neils (1992 and 1996).

Pandion I

Kastor: Pandion, son of Erikhthonios, 40 years (1437/6–1397/6).

Commentary

All our chronographic sources (*MP*, epoch 11; Eusebios and Synkellos, as well as Kastor) agree in naming Pandion the fifth king of Athens. Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.14.7–3.15.1) adds his wife's name (Zeuxippe, sister of his own mother, Erikhthonios' wife Praxithea) and names their children – Prokne, Philomela, Erekhtheus and Boutes. Since there are many tales attached to all these, not least the daughters, it is disappointing (and somewhat surprising) that no fragment has survived from any of the Atthidographers about Pandion. This is all the more peculiar, when one considers that Pandion became the eponym for one of the Kleisthenic tribes (Pandionis, no. 3 in the documentary lists; see Kron 1976:104–19) and was worshipped as such in the agora, had a cult statue on the acropolis (Pausanias: 1.5.5; see *IG*, II²: 1138, 1144, 1157) and was, probably, associated in some way with the archaic combined festival of Zeus, the Pandia (see Kron 1976:111–13; Kearns 1989:192; Parke 1977:136; Parker 1996:77). Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that there were actually two Pandions in the king-list, the second (on whom see below) being assigned the role of this character's grandson. It is usual to believe that one or the other was invented for the purpose of fixing the chronographic calculations, though one cannot be sure when or, even, which of the two was the clone. I suspect, on the basis of Herodotos (1.173 and 7.92) that it was this first Pandion who was invented.

Erekhtheus

Kastor: Erekhtheus, son of Pandion, 50 years (1397/6–1347/6).

MP, epoch 12 (1409/8): From the time when Demeter arrived at Athens and revealed the invention of grain and the first (festival) before [the ploughing] (*proeresia*) was held, (the ritual) [being demonstrated by] Triptolemos, son of Keleos and Neaira, 1146 years, when Erikhtheus was king at Athens.

MP, epoch 13 (1408/7): From the time when Tripto[lemos harvested the grain, which] he had sown in the (plain) called Rarian at Eleusis, 1145 years, when [Erikhtheus] was king at Athens.

MP, epoch 14 (1398/7): [From the time when Orpheus?...] made a public display of his own poem, both the rape of Kore and the search by Demeter and the [...] of those who received the fruit of the earth, 1135 years, when Erikhtheus was king at Athens.

MP, epoch 15 (? 1397/6–1373/2): [From the time when Eumolpos?...] revealed the Mysteries in Eleusis and made a public display of the poem of his [father M]ousaios, [11? years, when Erikhthe]us, son of Pandion, [was king at Athens].

43. Phanodemos F4 = Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Parthenoi: The daughters of Erekhtheus were given this name and honoured under this title. They were six in number. The oldest was Protogeneia, second was Pandora, third was Prokris, fourth Kreousa, fifth Oreithyia, sixth Khthonia. From these, it is said that Protogeneia and Pandora offered themselves for sacrifice on behalf of the country, when an invading force was approaching from Boiotia. They were sacrificed on the hill called Hyakinthos for the sake of the Sphendonai. Wherefore the Parthenoi are also called Hyakinthides, as Phanodemos testifies in the fifth (book) of *Atthis*, when he makes mention of their honour.

44. Phanodemos F27 = Scholion to Hesiod, *Theogony* 914. Hesiod, *Theogony* 913–14: ‘And she (sc. Demeter) bore Persephone of the white arms, whom Aidoneus snatched away from her mother, a gift from Zeus the planner’. Scholion: Some say that Persephone was snatched away from Sicily, Bakkhylides (says) from Crete, Orpheus (says) from regions around Okeanos, **Phanodemos (says) from Attika**, and Demeas from ...

45. Philokhoros F11 = Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge*

Chronographias p. 304 (Mosshammer): Erekhtheus was the sixth to rule over the Athenians. (He ruled) for 50 years. It was the 4104th year of world history. The daughter of this Erekhtheus, Orithyia, was snatched away by Boreas, a Thrakian, son of Astraios. **But the myth (treats him as) the wind, as Philokhoros says in (the) second.** In the time of this man (i.e. Erekhtheus) the so-called Mysteries were initiated.

46. Kleidemos F13 = Scholion to Kallimakhos (F7. 29 Pfeiffer), *P. Berol.* 11521: Now he has named all the Hellenes *in common* Ia[ones], after the Athenians. For these (i.e. the Athenians) were formerly called Iaones. [And] Homer, whenever he mentions 'Ionians with trailing tunics' (*Iliad*: 13.685), means the Athenians. **For originally they used to wear [tunics] that reached to their feet after the fashion of the Persians, [S]yr[ians and Kar]khe[d]lonians. Kleidemos reports this in the *Atthis*.** He has called the Hel[enes Athenians], (naming the whole) from the part, as Pindar (says) 'Athens pillar of H[ellas]'. And the Iaones got their name [from Ion], son of Xouthos, son of Aiolos, son of He[lLEN].

47. Kleidemos F19 = Scholion (B) to Euripides, *Medea* 19. Euripides, *Medea* 17–19: 'For betraying his own children and my mistress, Jason beds down with a royal bride, having married the daughter of Kreon...'. Scholion: We have already mentioned that some say Jason married the daughter of Hippotos, while others (say he married) the daughter of Kreon. Regarding the daughter of Kreon, the historians are not in agreement with Euripides. **For Kleitodemos (sic) says she was called Kreousa and that she married Xouthos**, while Anaxikrates (*FGrHist*: 307 F2) (says she was called) Glauke.

48. Philokhoros F12 and F194 = Scholion to Sophokles, *Oidipous at Kolonos* 100. Sophokles, *Oidipous at Kolonos* 100: 'Otherwise, a sober man like me (i.e. Oidipous) would not ever have met wineless ones (i.e. the Eumenides) like you first on my travels...'. Scholion: a sober man...wineless ones: For wine is not poured in libation to them (the Eumenides), but water, and libations for them are called 'wineless'. Polemon in his work *Against Timaios* says that there are wineless sacrifices to some other gods as well. He writes as follows: The Athenians, who are careful in such matters and pious in respect of the gods, make wineless sacrifices to Mnemosyne, the Muses, Dawn, Sun, Moon, the Nymphs and Heavenly Aphrodite. **And Philokhoros (F12) in (book) two of the *Atthides* mentions certain other sacrifices that are carried out in the same fashion, for both Dionysos and the daughters of Erekhtheus. And not only are the sacrifices wineless, but so too is some wood (sc. wineless), on which they are burnt.** Now, Krates the Athenian says that any wood that is

not from the vine is called wineless.

But Philokhoros (F194) more accurately says that neither wood from the vine nor wood from the fig, but rather wood from the thyme is called 'wineless'. And he says that they used this wood first for burnt sacrifices, on account of which thyme took its name, (arguing that/as though) the word was formed from the fumes (*thymia*) and the smell (*thyon*) given off in sacrifices.

49. Philokhoros F13 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Boedromia: Demosthenes (mentions this) in the *Philippics* (3.31). **There is a festival of this name at Athens, which Philokhoros says has been a customary practice since the day when Ion, son of Xouthos, enthusiastically assisted the Athenians, when they were being warred upon by Eumolpos, son of Poseidon, during the reign of Erekhtheus.** For 'giving assistance' is called 'Boedromein', that is, 'to run (dramein) to battle'.

50. Philokhoros F14 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Skiron: Lykourgos in the (speech) *On the Priestess*. The Skira is a festival amongst the Athenians, from which also the month Skirophorion (gets its name). Those who have written about the months and festivals at Athens, amongst whom is Lysimakhides (*FGrHist*: 366 F3), say that the *skiron* is a big umbrella, under the shade of which the priestess of Athena, the priest of Poseidon and the priest of the Sun process from the Acropolis to a certain place called Skiron. The Eteoboutadae carry it. And this is a sign of the necessity to build houses and make shelters, since this is agreed to be the best time for building. **And the Athenians honour Athena Skiras, whom Philokhoros says, in the second (book) of *Atthis*, was named after Skiros, an Eleusinian prophet.**

51. Philokhoros F15 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 11.92, 495e: Pentaploa: **Philokhoros (mentions this) in the second (book) of *Atthis*.** And Aristodemos, in the third (book) of his (work) *On Pindar* (*FGrHist*: 383 F9), says that at the Skira there is performed a contest in running of the ephebes. (He says) that they run holding a vine-branch, full of fruit, called the *Oskhos*. They run from the sanctuary of Dionysos to the sanctuary of Athena Skiras, and the winner receives a cup, the so-called *pentaploa*. He makes merry with a chorus of revellers. Now, the cup is called *pentaploa*, because it is a mixture of wine, honey and cheese with a little bit of barley and oil.

52. Philokhoros F103 = Natale Conti, *Mythologiae* 3.16 p. 245 (Geneva ed.): **Iambe was a woman in the service of Metanira, as Philokhoros reports. (She was) the daughter of Pan and Echo. When she saw the goddess feeling sad, she interjected some silly tales and witticisms in the iambic metre with a view to stirring the goddess to laughter and to calming her grief; wherefore that type**

of poem, that had not previously been witnessed, has been called 'iambic' after her, as is attested by Nikander in *Alexipharmaka*.

53a. Philokhoros F104a = Georgios Synkellos (Eusebios), *Ekloge Chronographias* (Mosshammer) 299.16: **Keleos was king of the city of Eleusis. During his time Triptolemos lived. Philokhoros says about him (Triptolemos) that, when he was approaching the cities in a warship to give them grain, it was suspected that his ship was a winged serpent. For the ship had something of that appearance.**

53b. Philokhoros F104b = Scholion to Aelius Aristides, p. 54.18 (Dindorf): **Philokhoros recounts that the ship that Triptolemos was on was considered winged for the reason that it was carried on fair winds.**

53c. Philokhoros F104c = Boccaccio, *Genealogia deorum gentilium* 8.4: **Concerning Triptolemos Philokhoros writes that he was a king of a region in Attika in very ancient times. He says that in a time of great scarcity Triptolemos' father Eleusios had been killed by an uprising of the people, because he had fed his son (i.e. Triptolemos) abundantly though the people were dying of hunger. So, Triptolemos fled away to foreign lands in a warship, which had a serpent for a standard, and only returned to his fatherland when he had acquired a large supply of grain. After he had expelled Keleos who was in occupation of the land (or according to others it was Lynkeus of Thrace), he was restored to his ancestral kingdom. Once restored, he not only gave food to his subjects, but also taught them how to till the soil by inventing the plough. As a result of that he was called the child of Ceres. There are, however, those who want it to be not Triptolemos but a certain Athenian called Buzyges who discovered the ox and the plough for the people of Attika. But Philokhoros says that Triptolemos lived many centuries before the time of Ceres, queen of the Syculi.**

54. Istros F22 = Scholion to Sophokles, *Oidipous at Kolonos* 1053. Sophokles, *Oidipous at Kolonos* 1051–3: '...for mortals, upon whose tongue is set the golden key of the attendant Eumolpidai'. Scholion: The question is, why ever the Eumolpidai, being foreigners, are initiators of the rites (sc. of Demeter and Kore). One could say that **some people think that the first Eumolpos, the son of Deiope daughter of Triptolemos, created the Mysteries at Eleusis, not the Thrakian. This is the account given by Istros in his (book) *About Oddities*.** And Akestodoros writes that the one who revealed the rites was the fifth from the first Eumolpos, as follows: 'The common report is that the first people to settle Eleusis were autokhthons. After (them were) the Thrakians who came with Eumolpos to help (the Eleusinians) in the war against Erekhtheus. Some say that Eumolpos also discovered the initiation rite that is performed annually for

Demeter and Kore at Eleusis'. Now Andron (*FGrHist*: 10 F13) writes that it was not the [first] Eumolpos, who discovered the rite of initiation, but the one born fifth from him. For Keryx was born of Eumolpos, Eumolpos (was born) from him, from him (was born) Antiphemos, from him (was born) Mousaios the poet and from him (was born) Eumolpos, the one who revealed the rite of initiation and was the [first] hierophant.

Commentary

Erekhtheus, after whom the Kleisthenic tribe Erekhtheis (tribe I in the lists) was named (see Kron 1976:32–83), is the oldest attested Athenian hero (Kearns 1989:160). He was known to Homer (*Iliad*: 2.546–52, *Odyssey*: 7.78–81) and Herodotos (8.55). For both he was an autokhthon, nourished by Athena, with whom he was closely associated on the acropolis, where he had his own shrine and was worshipped with sacrifices of bulls and rams (cf. *IG*, II²: 1357). His place of worship is usually identified with the building called the Erekhtheion (see Travlos 1971:213–27). This identification has been called into question recently, but has been vindicated by Hurwit (1999:200–9). It is a complex building shared by many, amongst whom were Zeus Hypatos, Poseidon, Erekhtheus, Boutes, Hephaistos and, of course, Athena Polias (Pausanias: 1.26.6). Attached to it is the Pandroseion, the shrine of Pandrosos (see [Chapter 1](#)), where were located the tomb of Kekrops and the olive tree of Athena. The main building was especially connected to the myth of the contest of Athena and Poseidon for Attika, and Poseidon's salt-water well and trident mark were contained within it. In fact, despite his close association with Athena, Erekhtheus himself received sacrifices on the altar of Poseidon, with whom he shared a cult title as Poseidon Erekhtheus (see *IG*, II²: 580; Euripides, *Erekhtheus*: F22.92–4). The ancestral rights to his priesthood were held by the aristocratic *genos* of the Eteoboutadai, whose eponymous hero, Boutes (see Kearns 1989:152–3), had his own altar in the building and was, in one account, believed to be the brother of Erekhtheus (Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.8). The building epitomizes the complexity of Athenian mythical tradition, out of which the Attidographers, from Hellanikos onward, had to make some sense. Erekhtheus was also honoured in the agora as an eponymous hero and may have had a cult at Rhamnous, where it was said that he had established a temple to Nemesis (*Souda* s.v. Rhamnousia Nemesis).

Several elements in the story of Athens were attached to Erekhtheus: as an autokhthon, he was considered a founding father, whose birth from the earth and nurture by Athena prefigured the myth of Erikhthonios (the two are treated as one by Loraux 2000:9–10), to whom they were transferred (as we have seen). He was involved in some sense with the contest of Athena and Poseidon for Attika, though this story eventually was assigned to the reign of Kekrops. He did,

however, retain two very important myths: the arrival of Demeter at Eleusis on her search for Persephone and her gift of grain (to Athens) were believed to belong to his reign, as was the Athenian war against Eumolpos of Thrace (with or without the participation of Eleusis; see Kearns 1989:113–15), which led to his death at the hands of Poseidon (see Thucydides: 2.15.1; Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.15.4; and Euripides, *Erechtheus*: F22 55–100, *Ion*: 281–2). Subsets of the latter myth are the stories of the Hyakinthides, his daughters, who supposedly sacrificed themselves to save the city and were appropriately *catasterized* (Euripides, *Erechtheus*: F22 65–89), and of Ion, son of Xouthos (or Apollo) and Kreousa (despite Kleidemos F19 = #47), who aided Erechtheus in the war and, afterwards, instituted the four Ionian tribes (Aigikoreis, Hopletes, Arkadeis and Geleontes) at Athens (Herakleides Lembos, *Epitome of Aristotle's Constitution of the Athenians*, F1; *Athenaion Politeia*: 41.2). These myths are touched upon by the fragments of the Atthidographers translated above. See further in [Appendix 8](#).

Kekrops II

Kastor: Kekrops, brother of Erekhtheus, 40 years (1347/6–1307/6).

Commentary

No stories are told about this king, which only goes to support the general opinion that he was simply a clone of Kekrops I (Diphyes), invented to make the chronology fit between the reign of Kekrops I and the Trojan War. If Jacoby is correct in his argument (*Text*: 42–51; *Notes*: 12–13) that Hellanikos' list of pre-Trojan kings contained only nine names, then Kekrops was not invented by him but by some later author. Jacoby (*Notes*: 12–13) favours Andron of Halikarnassos (*FGrHist*: 10) for this role.

Pandion II and the Athenian claim to Megara

Kastor: Pandion, son of Kekrops, 25 years (1307/6–1282/1).

55a. Androtion F61a = Scholion (T) to Homer, *Iliad* 13.685.

Homer, *Iliad* 13. 685: ‘Boiotians and Iaonians with long-trailing tunics...’. Scholion: There are others (sc. Iaones) ‘besides the Ionians’.

For the Iaones, Androtion says, after crossing over the frontier (from) Lakedaimon, set up a stele, which contained the inscription, ‘These (lands) are not Peloponnese, but Iaones’. And the Lakonians (set up a stele, which contained the inscription), ‘These (lands) are Peloponnese, not Iaones’.

55b. Androtion F61b = Scholion (B) to Homer, *Iliad* 13.685.

Scholion: There are other Iaones besides the Ionians: **For Androtion says that, after they crossed over the frontier from Lakedaimon, they set up a stele (which was inscribed) as follows: ‘These (lands) are not Peloponnese, but Iaones’. But the Ionians from the other side (set up a stele, which was inscribed) as follows: ‘These (lands) are not Iaones, but Peloponnese’. As a result some are on this side, others on that.**

56. Philokhoros F107/Those who wrote the *Attides* (FGrHist: 329) F2 = Strabo 9.1.5–6. C392. For Attike was of old called Ionia and Ias and, whenever the poet (sc. Homer) says ‘There (were) the Boiotians and the Iaones’, he means the Athenians. And the Megaris, too, was a part of this (sc. Attike). And, in particular, since the Peloponnesians and the Ionians were often in dispute over boundaries, amongst which was also Krommyonia, they made an agreement and set up a stele on the agreed-upon spot regarding the Isthmos itself. On the side facing the Peloponnese the stele bore the inscription ‘This (territory) is Peloponnese, not Ionia’. On the side facing Megara (the stele bore the inscription) ‘This (territory) is not Peloponnese, but Ionia’. **And those who wrote the *Attides*, although they disagreed about many things, agree at least about this (well anyway the worthwhile ones do), because when Pandion had four sons – Aigeus, Lykos, Pallas and Nisos, the fourth – and those sons divided Attike into four parts, Nisos got the Megaris as his lot and founded Nisaia. Well, Philokhoros says that the territory he ruled stretched from the Isthmos to the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo, and Andron (says it stretched) up to Eleusis and the Thriasian plain. Others have spoken in different places about this division (sc. of**

Attike) into four parts, but the following quotation from Sophokles will suffice here. He makes Aigeus say, 'My father ordained that I go off to the coastal promontories, allotting me the sovereignty of this land by virtue of my age'. Next, to Lykos he assigns 'the cultivated territory opposite Euboia', and for Nisos 'he chooses out the land neighbouring Skiron's promontory', while 'that harsh, giant-rearing Pallas took as his lot the part of the country facing the south'. So, this is the proof people use (to show) that the Megaris was a part of Attike.

Commentary

Pandion II is another cloned king, but in this case (as mentioned under Pandion I) it was probably the first who was inserted. At any rate, the main event associated with a king of this name – the division of the kingdom amongst his sons, Lykos (Kearns 1989:182), Nisos (Kearns 1989:188), Pallas (Kearns 1989:191) and Aigeus (see below), into four parts, one of which was the Megaris – was assigned to the later Pandion by Sophokles and probably earlier, since three of the sons (minus Aigeus, who is replaced by Orneus) are named on an early fifth-century vase (ARV²: 259.1). The tradition was also known to Herodotos (1.173.1, 7.92). In fact, Jacoby believes it was as old as the late-seventh century (*Text*: 430–1), and arose in the course of argument over boundaries between Athens and Megara (but cf. Kearns 1989:115–17; *Androktion* 190–1). The tradition was also referred to by Hellanikos in his *Priestesses* (*FGrHist*: 4 F75, F78 = Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Nisaia) and surely entered the *Atthis* through him. Further details are provided by Pausanias, who reports (1.5.3) that Pandion and his sons were driven out of Attika by the Metionidai, a clan whose eponym was believed to be a son of Erekhtheus and the father (or grandfather) of Daidalos (Kearns 1989:186), and settled in Megara, where Pandion married the daughter of the king Pylas, and eventually died and was buried. In fact, Pausanias saw a shrine to him there in a cave sacred to Athena and a memorial in the city (1.41.6), which suggests that Pandion may have originally been a Megarian hero (as was even more likely the case with his ‘son’, Nisos, see Kearns 1989:188, 191–2), but was hi-jacked by the Athenians in their efforts to justify their claim to Megara. Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.15.5–6) agrees with Pausanias and adds an account of how the sons returned to Athens, expelled the Metionidai, and then divided the kingdom along the lines described by Strabo, with Aigeus keeping the overall control by virtue of birth. Finally, two scholia to Aristophanes (*Lysistrata*: 8; *Wasps*: 1223) have somewhat confused the issue by naming the respective regions ruled by the sons with the same terminology used by Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 13.4) of the parties in Attika after Solon, i.e. Paralia (Pallas), Diakria (Lykos) and City (Aigeus). For those divisions see Rhodes (*Commentary*: 184–6), Sealey (1960:155–80) and for the implausibility of the parallel see Kearns (1989:116–17).

There can be no doubt that the whole story was known to the

Atthidographers, as Strabo says, but the only details for which they were cited were the extent of Aigeus' territory (up to the Pythion, the location of which is disputed; see Jacoby, *Text*: 428–9) and the delimiting stele on the Isthmus. The stele is, of course, a fiction and represents one of the most tendentious fabrications of the *Atthis*, created in blatant service of the Athenian claim to have ruled the Megaris. The Atthidographers cleverly had the stele eliminated by the Peloponnesians, who, after their defeat by the Ionians in battle during the reign of Kodros, nevertheless seized the Isthmus and settled Megara with Dorians (Strabo: 9.1.7 C393; Pausanias: 1.39.4; cf. Herodotos: 5.76). See the detailed analysis in Jacoby (*Text*: 427–31; *Notes*: 329–35) and Harding (*Androton*: 189–91).

Finally, one should note the extent to which the evolution of the story is directed towards Theseus. Not only is Aigeus, his father, given a primacy amongst the brothers that he may not have merited (Plutarch, *Theseus*: 13.1 records that the Pallantidai believed he was adopted by Pandion and another tradition may have placed Orneus as the fourth brother, Kearns 1989:116, 190), but the division of the kingdom, which was only partly ended by Aigeus, provided the background to his *synoikismos*. As his status as the Athenian hero *par excellence* grew, Theseus attracted to himself details that originally belonged to others. An example of that in this case is the version in Plutarch (*Theseus*: 25.4) that it was Theseus who had added Megara to Attika and also was responsible for setting up the stele on the Isthmus.

Aigeus

Kastor: Aigeus, son of Pandion, 48 years (1282/1–1234/3).

MP, epoch 19 (1294/3): From the time when a shortage of grain occurred and Apollo gave an oracular response to the Athenians, when they consulted him, that they should undertake whatever judgement Minos demanded, 1031 years, when Aig[eus] was king of the Athenians.

57. Phanodemos F5 = Natale Conti, *Mythologiae*, 9.10 p. 985 (Geneva ed.): **That, however, Aegeus, son of Pandion, succeeded his father on the throne, has been written as follows by Phanodemos in the fifth book (of the) *On Attic affairs*: Aigeus, son of Pandion, while king of Athens, marries first Meta, daughter of Hoples, second Khalkiope, daughter of Rhexenor.**

Commentary

Aigeus, eponym of the Kleisthenic tribe Aigeis (Kron 1976:120–40; Kearns 1989:142), tribe 2 in the official lists, features as little more than a foil to Theseus in the traditional tales. As we saw above, his elevation to the position of oldest son of Pandion justified Theseus' claim to the throne of Athens (even though he had to fight the sons of Pallas for it) and his death occasioned the only memorial of him in Athens (Pausanias: 1.22.5). It is not very surprising, therefore, that we do not have more fragments about him than this one from Phanodemos on his wives. Since, however, he played a supporting role to Theseus in Plutarch's life, and since the Attidographers were a major source for that biography, we may fairly assume that most of what Plutarch says about Aigeus would have been found in the *Atthis*. So, they surely recounted the tale of his childlessness, his visit to Delphi and his liaison with Aithra, daughter of Pittheus of Troizen, on the way home (*Theseus*: 3.5–7); the sorry state of his kingdom due to his age and the activities of the Pallantidai; the arrival of Theseus and his timely recognition by his father (*Theseus*: 12); the visit of Androgeos, son of Minos, to Athens and his death there, which caused the attack of Minos on Attika, the famine and oracle from Apollo (referred to by *MP*), and the eventual penalty of the seven boys and seven girls (*Theseus*: 15); and the story of the black and white sails and Theseus' mistake that caused Aigeus to throw himself to his death (*Theseus*: 17, 22).

Most of the same information is recorded by Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.15.5–16.2), who agrees verbatim with the fragment from Phanodemos on Aigeus' first and second wives. Apollodoros adds a reference to Minos' capture of Megara from Nisos during his invasion of Attika, a capture that was brought about through the treachery of Nisos' daughter Scylla (a myth that was first mentioned by Aiskhylos, *Libation Bearers*: 612–22, known to Pausanias: 1.19.5, and embellished by Ovid, *Metamorphoses*: 8.6–151). To the story of the famine at Athens during its siege by Minos Apollodoros attaches the narrative of the sacrifice of the daughters of the Lakedaimonian, Hyakinthos (see [Appendix 8](#)). Aigeus is also mentioned by Pausanias who attributes the foundation of the sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania (Heavenly) to him, in the hope of curing his childlessness (1.14.7), and both Pausanias and Herodotos attest to the story that he drove his brother, Lykos, from Attika to Asia, where he became the eponym of

the Lykians (Herodotos: 1.173; Pausanias: 1.19.4).

THESEUS THE ARCHETYPICAL ATHENIAN

Theseus, who became the most significant Athenian hero from the mythical period, is too large a subject to be treated properly in a book of this scope. His myth is presented in detail by Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.15.6 – Epitome 1.24) and a full biography of him was written in antiquity by Plutarch. Since the Atthidographers were clearly a major source for Plutarch's study, one can get a good idea of what they said by reading his *Theseus*. In addition, Theseus has been the subject of several very detailed modern investigations, notably those by Herter (1939), Ward (1970), Brommer (1982), Kearns (1989:117–24, 168–9), Calame (1990), Walker (1995) and Mills (1997). Consequently, after a brief resume of the role he was made to play in Athenian historiography, I shall turn to short notes on the fragments, giving especial attention to what they can tell us about the differences between the treatment he was given by the individual Atthidographers.

It is generally agreed that Theseus was not originally an Athenian hero. Rather, he had strong connections with Troizen, and probably a stronger association with the region of north-east Attika, in the territory of the Marathonian tetrapolis or, more specifically, the deme of Aphidna. Some of his exploits undoubtedly had roots in the heroic age and were depicted in art and literature as early as the late eighth century. These exploits were of a rather swashbuckling kind involving brigandage and, especially, the abduction of women (e.g. Helen and Persephone). Even the ostensibly more valiant defeat of the Minotaur was achieved with the aid of a woman (Ariadne), whom he abandoned on his way home. In short, Theseus' early exploits had much the same character as those of Herakles or Jason, and left him exposed to the same ridicule that they received at the hands of the sophisticated poets of the fifth century onwards. But this did not happen, because at some time in the sixth century he began to emerge as a national hero for the unified Athenian state, a phenomenon that is epitomized by his being credited with the political unification (*synoikismos*) of Attika (Walker 1995:3–24; Mills 1997:1–42). It is generally believed that the essential form of his story was set out in an epic (*Theseis*) before the end of the

century, though the fifth-century democracy undoubtedly rounded out his image for its propaganda purposes.

It is probably wasted energy to try to decide who was responsible for Theseus' elevation to stardom, whether it was Peisistratos (e.g. Connor in Ward 1970:145, 150) or Kleisthenes, as many believe (see Kearns 1989:117), or even Kimon (Vidal-Naquet 1986:313; Parker 1996:168–70). It is probably best to see his emergence into the role of primary Athenian national hero as an evolutionary process (Mills 1997:1–42) that may even have begun with Solon and been refined thereafter by succeeding generations of politicians and artists (and in the public consciousness) down through the end of the fifth century. At that point the story passed into the hands of the Attidographers. The Theseus they inherited was a hero who was a projection of the *persona* of imperial Athens, as the Athenians wanted the outside world to see it. So, like Athens, he was the youthful champion of the civilized against the barbarian, as witnessed by his conquest of the Minotaur, his participation in the battle of the Lapiths against the Centaurs and his defeat of the Amazons. In his mature role he was the protector of suppliants, as exemplified by his assistance to Adrastus and his offering of refuge to Oedipus. His days of brigandage and rape had either been justified or politely ignored. Finally, at home he was the founder of the state through his *synoikismos* and the creation of the basic prerequisites of the democratic constitution and his supposed abdication from power (see Thuc.: 2.15.2; Herakleides, *On Constitutions*: F1; Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 41.2 and F2; Pausanias: 1.3.4). But, even though Pausanias' report (10.10) of the Marathon monument at Delphi has been taken by some to suggest otherwise (see Kron 1976:215–27; Kearns 1989:81; Walker 1995:58–9), Theseus had not been chosen to be the eponym of any of the ten Kleisthenic tribes. This may appear strange at first sight, since he was already marked out to be the greatest Athenian hero, but that may well be the reason. It appears he was designed to play a role above the others.

As we shall see from the following discussion of the fragments, the reaction of the Attidographers to this constructed image was complex. Their Theseus was a blend of the old and the new, and whilst for the most part they accepted the outline of the nationalistic vision, their attempts to rationalize and add touches of historical realism led them to disagree with it in many points of detail.

Kastor: Theseus, son of Aigeus, 30 years (1234/3–1204/3).

MP, epoch 20 (1259/8): From the time when Thes[eus]..., while ruling Athens, brought together the twelve cities into one unit and handed down the <united> administration and the democracy...of

Athens after killing Sinis he established the contest of the Isthmia, 995 years.

MP, epoch 21 ([125]6/5): From the time of the [invasion of the] Am[az]on[s] into Attike, [950]+42 years (i.e. 992), when Theseus was king of Athens.

MP, epoch 22 (1251/0): From the time when the Argives campaigned with Adras[os against The]bes and they established the contest at [Neme]a..., 987 years, when Theseus was king of Athens.

Theseus and the Pallantidai

58. Philokhoros F108 = Scholion to Euripides, *Hippolytos* 35.

Euripides, *Hippolytos* 34–5: ‘When Theseus quits the Kekropian land, fleeing the pollution of the blood of the Pallantidai’. Scholion:

Philokhoros gives the following account of how the Pallantidai were

destroyed by Theseus: **When Pallas is planning to attack Athens and is advancing openly along the Sphettian road in the direction of the city with his forces, his sons by agreement with their father lie in wait at Gargettos with a group of young friends. Their intention is that, when Pallas engages in battle with the Athenians who have come out against him, they will issue forth from their ambush and take the city. However, a certain man, who was acting as herald for Pallas, reports what is going on to Theseus.**

Whereupon, he and his young followers make a sudden attack and destroy them (sc. the sons).

Commentary

We do not have any fragments from the Atthidographers concerning Theseus' birth (as a result of Aigeus' loosing of the wineskin), his childhood, or his exploits on the way from Troizen to Athens, which are reported in Plutarch (chapters 3–11) and Apollodoros (*Bibliotheka*: 3.15. 6–7, 16.1–Epitome 1.1–4). Though these were unquestionably late additions to the story, there is no reason to believe that our authors did not have something to say on these issues and, in fact, echoes of them can be found in some of the preserved fragments (e.g. Aithra, daughter of Pittheus, is referred to as Theseus' mother in #76c and #79, and #80 mentions the daughters of Kerkyon and Sinis). The first event in Theseus' life that is touched upon is in this fragment from Philokhoros and concerns the battle he supposedly fought against his father's brother, Pallas, and his gigantic sons, the Pallantidai (on whom see Kearns 1989:115–17, 191) immediately after his return to Athens and his recognition by Aigeus. It is recounted in much the same terms in Plutarch, chpt. 13, though Jacoby feels that the two accounts are 'not identical' (*Text*: 433).

One detail that Plutarch supplies that is absent from the scholion is the name of Pallas' herald, Leos of Hagnous (Kearns 1989:181), whose treachery secured Theseus' escape from the ambush that had been set for him and his triumph over these opponents. It is hard to believe that the original version of Philokhoros' account did not give the name also. If so, he probably would have provided us with more detail about this person, which might have helped identify him with or distinguish him from Leos, the eponym of the Kleisthenic tribe Leontis, and establish what relationship, if any, he had to the Leokoreion, an important religious building just inside the city-walls where Hipparkhos was assassinated (Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 18.3), and/or to the daughters of Leos (Leokorai), who were sacrificed to save the city (Dem.: 60.29; Diod.: 17.15; Kearns 1989:181).

The elimination of the Pallantidai was, of course, a necessary step in the reintegration of their territory into the kingdom (that had been arbitrarily fragmented in the tradition about the reign of Pandion) as a prerequisite to the *synoikismos*. The territory with which they were associated in this story was in the *mesogaia* in the area bounded by Hagnous, Sphettos, Gargettos and Pallene, even though both ancient and modern scholars tend to assign the *Paralia* to Pallas.

Theseus the wrestler

59. Hellanikos F3 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Phorbanteion: Hyperides in the (speech) *Against Patrokles* (mentions this). That the Phorbanteion at Athens was named after Phorbas, who was king of the Kouretes and who was killed by Erekhtheus, is made clear by Andron (*FGrHist*: 10 F1) in the eighth (book) of *Family Relationships*.

Phorbas was the son of Poseidon, according to Hellanikos in (book) one of *Atthis*.

60. Istros F31 = Scholion to Pindar, *Nemean* 5.90 (Snell). Pindar, *Nemean* 5.90: 'It is necessary that there be a man from Athens (to act) as a fashioner for athletes'. Scholion: They say that the art of wrestling was invented at Athens by Phorbas, the trainer of Theseus. But some say the opposite, namely that Theseus learned wrestling from Athena and Phorbas from Theseus. Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3 F152; Fowler, *Pherekydes* F152) says that Phorbas was Theseus' charioteer, together with whom he abducted the Amazon. And Polemon records that wrestling was invented by an Athenian (called) Phorbas. **But Istros records that Theseus learned wrestling from Athena.**

Commentary

The identity of the hero, Phorbas, is as uncertain as is the whereabouts of the Phorbanteion, the shrine that was dedicated to him in Athens. The tradition that Hellanikos preserved does not connect Phorbas with Theseus, rather it associates him with the Eleusinian war between Eumolpos and Erekhtheus. His claim that Phorbas was a son of Poseidon is consistent with that notion. However, Andron's statement that he was king of the Kouretes raises difficulties, since the Kouretes were located in Aitolia and no tradition involves them with the Eleusinian war.

Later Phorbas, like so many other obscure heroes, was attracted into the orbit of Theseus and became variously his trainer or his charioteer. He was also transformed into an Athenian (if, that is, he was not an Athenian all along). In all likelihood he had some original association with the art of wrestling, though it is hard to recover what that was. At any rate, as the tradition of Theseus' skill in that area developed, probably in response to Herakles' fame, until he became the acknowledged inventor and teacher of the art (Pausanias: 1.39.3), Phorbas suffered a consequent subordination (see Jacoby, *Text*: 26–7, 645–6).

Theseus, the Marathonian bull and Hekale

61. Philokhoros F109 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 14: Theseus did not wish to sit on his laurels, so in order to gain public support he went on an expedition against the Marathonian bull, which was causing no little distress to the inhabitants of the Tetrapolis. He overpowered it and made a display of driving it alive through the city before he sacrificed it to Apollo Delphinios. And the story told about Hekale and her hospitable reception of Theseus (on this occasion) does not appear to be totally devoid of truth. For when the demes located in the vicinity gather together for their customary sacrifice to Zeus Hekaleios at the Hekalesia, (at that time) they also honour Hekale, whom they address by the endearing diminutive ‘Hekaline’, because of the fact that, when she entertained Theseus who was very young at the time, she caressed him in the way old people do and spoke to him with similar words of endearment. And since she had vowed for Theseus’ sake, as he was on his way to the fight, that she would sacrifice to Zeus if he came back safe, but had died before he returned, Theseus ordained that she receive the aforementioned (honours) as the return for her hospitality. This is the way Philokhoros tells the story in his history.

Commentary

The story of Theseus and the bull of Marathon is generally agreed to be one of the earliest elements in the myth and, because of it, some even think that Theseus' origins belong in the vicinity of the Marathonian tetropolis. When a *Theseis* was created in the late sixth century, it certainly contained this incident (though maybe by that time the incident had acquired new significance by association with the Persian War, as Sourvinou-Inwood [1979] speculates). Consequently, we can safely assume that all Atthidographers from Hellanikos onward recounted the tale in some fashion. Whether that also involved the story of Hekale is not so clear. Philokhoros is our only witness to that and his narrative was beyond doubt the inspiration and basis for Kallimakhos' famous poem, *Hekale*, which popularized that charming old woman and her hospitality for subsequent generations (Jacoby, *Text*: 434–7; Hollis 1990:5–10). We know nothing independently about Hekal(in)e (if, indeed, she was a person originally) or her cult. What we can infer, with some degree of certainty, is that a festival (*Hekalesia*) of Zeus Hekaleios was practised by the inhabitants of a group of demes in northern Attika (presumably somewhere between Mt Pentelikon and Marathon) and that it was so old even Philokhoros knew little about it. Tradition personalized the cult title into the eponym of a deme, Hekale (Kearns 1989:92, 95, 121, 157–8), whose location is variously sited by modern topographers at Koukounari or (A)mygdaleza (Traill 1975:46 and maps 1 and 2; Hollis 1990:7, n.10). For the interpretation of the story as an 'enrolment' ritual for the young Theseus see Robertson (1992:131–2).

Theseus and the Kretan Minotaur

62. Hellanikos F14 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F164) = Plutarch, *Theseus* 17.3: Hellanikos says that the boys and girls who were sent out by the city (sc. to Krete) were not chosen by lot, but that Minos himself used to choose them in person and that he chose Theseus first of all in accordance with the defined terms. He says that the terms were that the Athenians provide the ship, that the young persons should embark and sail with him carrying no weapon of war, and that the penalty should end when the Minotaur died.

63. Kleidemos F17 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 19.8: Kleidemos' report on this matter (i.e. Theseus' journey to Krete) is remarkably original. Beginning from a point further back (in the events), he says that there was a common resolution amongst the Hellenes that no ship should sail from any place with more than five men on board and that Jason, commander of the Argo, only sailed around [with more], because he was excluding pirates from the sea. But when Daidalos fled by ship to Athens, Minos pursued him with warships in contravention of the resolution, but was driven by a storm to Sicily, where he ended his life. Deukalion, his son, was of a hostile disposition towards the Athenians and sent them a demand that they hand over Daidalos to him, threatening that otherwise he would kill the young persons whom Minos had taken as hostages. Theseus gave a mild reply to this demand, requesting reprieve for Daidalos, who was his cousin and related to him by birth, since he was the son of Merope daughter of Erekhtheus. Meanwhile Theseus threw himself into the task of shipbuilding, partly in Thymaitadai in Attika far from the travelled road, partly in Troizen under the supervision of Pittheus, because he wanted no one to know (what he was doing). When the ships were ready, he sailed out, taking with him Daidalos and some exiles from Krete as guides. Because no one had foreknowledge of this and because the Kretans thought that the ships that were approaching were friendly, he gained control of the harbour, disembarked and got all the way to Knossos before anyone found out. There he fought a battle at the gates of the Labyrinth and killed both Deukalion and his bodyguard. When Ariadne took charge of affairs, he made a truce with her, under which he got back the young persons and concluded a pact of friendship between the

Athenians and the Kretans, who swore never to initiate war (against the Athenians).

64. Demon F5 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 19.1: When he sailed into Krete, according to the account given by most writers and poets, he received the thread from Ariadne, who had fallen in love with him, and, after being instructed how he could make his way out through the windings of the Labyrinth, he killed the Minotaur and sailed off taking Ariadne and the youths with him. But Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3 F150; Fowler, *Pherekydes* F150) says that Theseus also stove in the floors of the Kretan ships, so preventing pursuit. **But Demon says that Tauros, Minos' general, was also killed, fighting a naval battle in the harbour as Theseus was sailing out.**

65. Philokhoros F111 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 17.6: And Simonides also says that the helmsman of his (Theseus') ship was Phereklos son of Amarsyas. **But Philokhoros says that Theseus got his helmsman, Nausithoos, and his prowman, Phaiax, both sent to him by Skiros from Salamis, since the Athenians had not at that time any experience with the sea. And he says that Skiros did this because Menesthes, one of the youths, was his daughter's son. Supporting evidence for these details can be found in the hero-shrines of Nausithoos and Phaiax, which Theseus dedicated at Phaleron near the sanctuary of Skiros. Philokhoros also says that the festival of the Kybernesia was celebrated for them.**

66a. Philokhoros F17a = Plutarch, *Theseus* 15.2–16.1, continued at 19.4–7: The version of the story most popular with the tragic poets depicts the young people who were transported to Krete being destroyed by the Minotaur in the Labyrinth, or represents them wandering around and dying because they could not find the way out. And the Minotaur in Euripides' words was: 'Of mixed form and monstrous birth' (Fr. 96), 'A mixture with twofold nature of bull and man' (Fr. 97). (16.1) **But Philokhoros says that the Kretans do not agree with that depiction. They say that while the Labyrinth was a prison, it had nothing bad about it except for the fact that the prisoners could not escape. Furthermore, they say that Minos used to celebrate athletic contests for (the death of) Androgeus and used to give the youngsters as prizes to the winners (in the contests). In the meantime, they were kept prisoners in the Labyrinth. And the man who was victorious in the previous contests (i.e. prior to the one involving Theseus) was Minos' general, named Tauros, who at that time had very great influence at his court. Now this man was immoderate and savage in character and behaved in an arrogant and harsh manner toward the young Athenians.... (19.4) But, as Philokhoros records it, when Minos was celebrating the games (i.e. for Androgeus) and Tauros**

was expected to defeat all opponents once again, there was a general feeling of resentment. For, his great influence was hard to bear because of his character, and there was a slanderous report that he was too cosy with Pasiphae. For that reason Minos agreed to Theseus' request when he asked to enter the contest. Now, since it was a custom in Krete for women also to be spectators at contests, Ariadne was present and was both struck with wonder at the sight of Theseus and amazed at his physical condition, as he overpowered allcomers. Minos, too, was particularly pleased when Tauros was defeated in wrestling and made to look foolish, so he gave the young people back to Theseus and relinquished the city from its bond of tribute.

66b. Philokhoros F17b = Georgios Synkellos (Eusebios), *Ekloge Chronographias* (Mosshammer) p. 308–9, (Adler and Tuffin, p. 236–7): The events related to the Minotaur (took place): according to the legend, he was a hybrid monster born from an animal (a bull) and Pasiphae; he feasted upon the young people who were brought from the Athenians as tribute. **But, as the Kretans themselves tell it, Minos' general, who was called Tauros, was a savage and ungentle person by nature. When Minos was celebrating the games that he established in honour of Androgeus, who was killed by the Athenians, he was in the habit of giving the young people as a prize of victory, and Tauros, because he was strong, used to overcome all his opponents. But when Theseus was permitted to take part in the contest and he beat Tauros in wrestling, the outcome was that the youngsters were saved and the city was released from (paying) the tribute, as Philokhoros records in the second (book) of *Atthis*.**

66c. Philokhoros F17c = Boccaccio, *Genealogia deorum gentilium* 11.26: And granted that in the same passage one can read that Plato believed that this (account) was untrue, **nevertheless the details that can be read from Philochoros' account of the Minotaur in his book of the *Atthis* agree with it, even though what is said afterwards by Eusebios disagrees somewhat.**

Commentary

The story of Theseus and the Minotaur was one of the earliest, best and most widely known parts of the tradition (see Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.15.7–8, Epitome 1.7–15). It was frequently represented in both art and literature (see Brommer 1982:35–64; cf. Walker 1995:15–20; Mills 1997:13–18). It is also a theme attested by a large number of fragments from the Atthidographers and one that provides a good opportunity for observation of the differences between them.

Hellanikos: Not surprisingly the first Atthidographer's version appears to be the most traditional. In fact, it must be assumed that with his background in Panhellenic mythography Hellanikos would have had some difficulty accepting the developed Athenian version of the Theseus myth. So, we find him denying the use of the lot (an anachronistically democratic procedure) in the selection of the youths. Further, there is no indication that he humanized the Minotaur, as became the practice with some later Atthidographers. On the other hand, he clearly viewed Minos in human terms (but then so did Thucydides, see 1.4), and added a touch of historical realism by providing the terms of the penalty.

Kleidemos: By contrast with the above, the first Athenian to write an *Atthis* was nothing short of revisionist in his approach (see Jacoby, *Text*: 74–5). Even Plutarch was taken aback at the amount of original detail Kleidemos claimed to know both here and in his account of the battle against the Amazons (#75). The outlandish nature of this version is obvious, beginning with the anachronistic reference to an international agreement on the number of sailors allowed on ships, passing on to the notion that it was Jason and not Minos who had rid the seas of pirates (*contra* Thucydides: 1.4) and continuing by doing away with the whole story of the penalty imposed upon Athens by Minos over the death of Androgeos and the resultant heroism of Theseus and his tragic betrayal of Ariadne. All this has gone. Whilst the notion that Minos pursued Daidalos to Sicily and died there was not original (it was known to Herodotos: 4.170.1, and reported by Diodoros: 4.79, Pausanias: 7.4.6 and Apollodoros: Epitome 1.15), it is quite new that his son has become the aggressor (in the guise of a tyrant with a bodyguard), and that the flight of Daidalos has become the cause of hostilities with Theseus, who, now a mature monarch, is depicted as the founder of Athenian naval power (a sort of proto-Themistokles) and control of the seas. Finally, the relationship

between Theseus and Ariadne has been revisited. Gone is the unflattering story of her abandonment. As legitimate Queen of Knossos she enters into a treaty of unlimited duration with Theseus, a type of treaty that first appeared in the fourth century (*Documents*: no. 14, n. 1).

Demon: As the reference to Pherekydes in this passage of Plutarch shows, the practice of embellishing the narrative of Theseus' exploits with 'realistic' details was not restricted to the Atthidographers, but was well established before Hellanikos. Nevertheless, the Atthidographers did pursue rationalized realism with zeal. Here, we find attributed to Demon the first attested instance of the humanizing of the Minotaur into a general of Minos' forces, named Tauros. We cannot be sure that he was the first to take this step, though it is not unlikely: Kleidemos obviously had no place for Tauros or the Minotaur in his account and the absence of any reference to Androtion or Phanodemos suggests that they had not contributed anything original. He was, however, not the last, as #66a and b reveal. Demon appears to have accepted Kleidemos' idea that Theseus fought a battle on Krete, though his was a naval engagement 'in the harbour', not a land battle 'at the gates of the Labyrinth' (Jacoby, *Text*: 205).

Philokhoros: With the last Atthidographer we come to the most sophisticated version of all. It is not, however, any more 'historical'; in fact, it contains additional elements of creative writing. #65 reveals that Philokhoros rejected Kleidemos' depiction of Theseus as the founder of the Athenian navy. Rather he used the excuse of Athens' supposed lack of naval experience to incorporate into his narrative a group of lesser heroes from Salamis (Nausithoos/Nauseiros, Phaiax and Skiros), who were worshipped at Phaleron in association with an obscure festival for helmsmen (*kybernesia*) that involved the *genos* of the Salaminioi (Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 37). This is consistent with other evidence that shows Philokhoros' interest in and knowledge of little-known cults. It also shows the importance of existing religion and cult to the genesis of elements of the *Atthis* and, at the same time, is a good example of the way that Theseus came to absorb other heroes and festivals into his orbit (Kearns 1989:38–41, 106–7, 120–1, 187, 197–8), so that by the fourth century he had become the 'great source of ritual meaning' at Athens (Parker 1996:169).

#66 is illustrative for many reasons. First, like Kleidemos and Demon before him, Philokhoros rejected the poetic vision of the Minotaur as a hybrid monster. In doing that these Atthidographers were opposing what surely would also have been the popular concept. Like his predecessor Demon, whose work he supposedly despised, he humanized the Minotaur into Tauros, but he embellished the story considerably. His interesting claim that he was basing his originality

upon a Kretan source at least demonstrates a desire to add substance to his version through the use of independent evidence, though it goes without saying that that source had no claim to historical credibility. Whilst his version is more in touch with the traditional tale than, for example, Kleidemos', Philokhoros has rationalized almost every element. So, Theseus is one of the young Athenians sent to Krete as tribute, but they are there to be given away as prizes, not put to death. The Labyrinth is still in the story, but it has been demoted to an inescapable prison rather than a maze. Minos remains the protagonist and Androgeos' death is the cause, but Theseus' heroic contest has been turned into a typical Greek wrestling match and Tauros just another competitor. His arrogant character and the hint of a relationship with Pasiphae (a nice touch) explain why he was unpopular, not least with Minos. Ariadne's interest in Theseus is caused by her sight of his physical condition, which (realistically) is explained by reference to a Kretan custom of allowing women to be spectators at games. The end of the story, however, leaves no room for her elopement with Theseus, and so we have to assume that Philokhoros eliminated the unsavoury abandonment. Beyond question Philokhoros knew how to tell a good yarn and give it the air of verisimilitude!

Theseus and the Oskhophoria

67. Demon F6 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 23.2: They celebrate also the festival of the Oskhophoria, which was established by Theseus. For it is told that he did not take along all the maids who were on that occasion selected by the lot, but without anyone noticing inserted amongst their number two of his young male friends who were feminine in appearance and fresh-looking, but like men in their courage and earnestness. By means of hot baths and secluded living out of the sun, by adornments and unguents for their hair and the smoothness of their skin and complexion he brought about the most complete transformation (of them) possible. Next he taught them to imitate as closely as possible the voice, appearance and gait of girls until they were in no respect different. When he returned, he marched in procession with the young men, dressed in the same way as those who nowadays carry the grape-laden vine shoots (sc. in the Oskhophoria). They carry (these branches) as an obligation to Dionysos and Ariadne because of the story, or rather because they returned when the harvest (of grapes) was being gathered. The Deipnophoroi (women who carry the dinner) are involved also and take part in the sacrifice, in imitation of the mothers of those young people who were chosen by lot. For they used to visit their children and bring them meat and bread. And tales are told (at the festival), because of the fact that those mothers also told tales to the children to encourage and console them. Anyway, this is what Demon has also recorded.

68. Philokhoros F183 = *Lexikon rhetoricum* p. 239.7, s.v.

Deipnophoros: The name of a festival. For the *deipnophoria* ('carrying of meals') is to carry meals to the daughters of Kekrops, Herse, Pandrosos and Agraulos. And meals were provided in a lavish manner, according to the mystical account. And the common people used to do this. For it brings honour. **And Philokhoros says that the mothers of the twice seven children, who had been shut up in preparation for being sent to the Minotaur, sent them a meal every day and visited them, and that after their return, *as if fulfilling a prayer, children called 'meal-bearers' carry meals in the festival.*** (NB The text between the asterisks is quite corrupt.)

69. Philokhoros F16 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Oskhophoroi: Hypereides (mentions these) in the (speech) *Against Demeas*, if it is

genuine. **Several authors have mentioned the Oskhophoroi, especially Philokhoros in (book) twelve (two?).**

70. Istros F8 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Oskhophoroi: Several authors have mentioned the Oskhophoroi, especially Philokhoros in (book) twelve (two?) (#69). **And Istros, when writing about Theseus in his thirteenth (book), says the following: in recognition of their common escape (i.e. from the Minotaur) he decreed that the youths called the oskhophoroi be chosen, two (in number) from amongst those who stood out by birth and wealth. The oskhe is a vine-branch with bunches of grapes hanging from it. Some people call this an ‘oreskhas’.**

Commentary

One only has to look at a standard modern account of the festival of the *Oskhophoria* (e.g. Parke 1977:77–80) to realize how fundamental these fragments are to our knowledge. They provide us with almost all the details we have. But those details relate to the festival as it existed in the fourth century (though see Philokhoros F14 (#50) with Jacoby's commentary, *Text*: 285–305), after the *Oskhophoria* (along with the *Synoikia*, *Hekalesia*, *Pyanopsia* and *Kybernesia*) had been associated with incidents in the Theseus story in a process that has recently been dubbed 'an *interpretatio Theseana*' (Parker 1996:169). In this case, what was clearly in origin a festival in honour of Dionysos and Athena (*pace* Robertson 1992:120–33, who believes the festival reflected an old enrolment ritual for young boys) had been transformed into a celebration of the return of Theseus and the other Athenian youths from Krete. In that process a number of obscure rituals in the cult (e.g. the food carried by the *deipnophoroi*, the telling of tales, the presence of the two transvestites and the herald with his crown on his staff) acquired new significance. To what extent the Salaminioi, the *genos* closely involved in the festival, had contributed to or manipulated the interpretation is unclear, but see Kearns (1989:164 s.v. Eurysakes), Parker (1996:308–16) and Rhodes and Osborne (2003: no. 37). For more discussion on these fragments see Jacoby, *Text*: 205–9, 285–305, 551–2, 634. Note that in #68, which Jacoby assigns to Philokhoros' work *On Festivals* rather than the *Atthis*, the historian appears to concede the existence of the Minotaur.

Theseus and the Isthmian Games

71. Hellanikos F15 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F165) = Plutarch, *Theseus* 25.5: And he (sc. Theseus) first established the contest (sc. the Isthmian games) in emulation of Herakles, out of an ambition that the Hellenes should celebrate the Isthmia to Poseidon through his action, just as they celebrated the Olympic Games to Zeus through the agency of Herakles. The ceremony for Melikertes that already existed there was performed at night, having more the format of a ritual than a public gathering and a spectacle... So, he organized (the festival) and established the condition with the Corinthians that they should provide front-row seating for those Athenians who attended the Isthmia, (seating) that should be as extensive as the area covered by the sail of the sacred ship, when it was spread out. This is what Hellanikos and Andron of Halikarnassos (*FGrHist*: 10 F6) record.

Commentary

The Athenian claim that Theseus founded the Isthmian Games is, of course, no more credible than that he brought about the political unification of Attika. It is another part of their developed, national propaganda that, especially in the fifth century, liked to depict him as a latter-day Herakles with his own divine parent (Mills 1997:26–42). The claim was, however, accepted by Hellanikos and passed down by the *Atthis* to the chronographers (see *MP*, epoch 20). In reality, from their incorporation as a Panhellenic festival in 581 (Eusebios), the *Isthmia* had been in the hands of the Corinthians. At some point, however, the Athenians had acquired the privilege of *prohedria* (front-row seating), and the manifest fiction reported here by Hellanikos was surely created to justify this. The statement that the privilege was a condition with specified terms that Theseus had arranged with the Corinthians may well have originated with Hellanikos, who seemed to like to provide such details (see #62 and Jacoby, *Text*: 37–8).

Theseus and the Amazons

72a. Hellanikos F16a (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F166) = Plutarch, *Theseus* 26.1: ...But the majority (of sources), amongst whom are Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3 F151) and Hellanikos and Herodoros (*FGrHist*: 31 F25), say more credibly that Theseus sailed after Herakles on his own expedition and that he took the Amazon captive as a prisoner.

72b. Hellanikos F16b (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F107) = Scholion Tzetzes on *Antehomerica* 23: On what account (are they called) Amazons? Because they cut off their right breast so that it may not get in the way of their archery. That (is) false. For they would be destroyed. But Hellanikos says, and so does Diodoros (2.45.3), that they cauterize this area (of their bodies) before they grow up, so that they cannot nurse.

73. Philokhoros F110 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 26.1: And he sailed to the Euxine Sea, as Philokhoros and some others say, accompanying Herakles on his campaign against the Amazons, and took Antiope as his prize of honour.

74a. Hellanikos F17a (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F167a) = Plutarch, *Theseus* 27.1: Well then, the war of the Amazons had this cause. And it does not appear to have been a slight or womanish accomplishment of his. For (the Amazons) would not have encamped in the city nor joined battle at close quarters around the Pnyx and the Mouseion, if they could not approach the city with impunity because they had control of the countryside. As for the hypothesis, that Hellanikos records, that they made their way around (sc. to Athens) by crossing the Kimmerian Bosphoros when it was frozen, that is difficult to believe. But the fact that they pitched their tents virtually in the city (centre) is attested to by the names of places and by the burial places of those who fell in battle.

74b. Hellanikos F17b (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F167b) = Scholion Tzetzes on Lykophron, *Alexandra* 1332: And he says that they (sc. the Amazons) made war on Athens on account of the girdle, but Hellanikos the Lesbian says that they crossed over the Kimmerian Bosphoros when it was frozen and entered Attika and laid it waste by war for four months. He does not, however, mention the reason.

74c. Hellanikos F17c (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F167c) = Scholion

Tzetzes on *Antehomerica* 22: Of those who write history Hellanikos, on the one hand, says (as follows):

When the Kimmerian Bosporos was frozen solid, once upon a time there came across (it) the Amazons in a very large army with shields of gold and axes of silver, a female force, man-emulating, male-child-murdering. And (this army) divides amongst itself the flat parts of the land over a wide area, and strikes up the clashings of battles.

75. Kleidemos F18 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 27.2–7: For a long time both sides (i.e. the Athenians and the Amazons) held back and hesitated to begin the engagement. Finally, Theseus, after making a sacrifice to Phobos (Fear) in accordance with an oracle, joined battle with them. And the battle took place in the month of Boedromion, on the day when the Athenians still to this day celebrate the Boedromia.

Kleidemos, in his desire to be accurate in every detail, recounts that the left wing of the Amazons inclined towards what is now called the Amazoneion, while on the right they reached to the Pnyx opposite the Golden (statue of victory). (He says) that the Athenians fought against this (left wing), falling upon the Amazons from the Mouseion, and that the tombs of the fallen are located on either side of the street leading in the direction of the gate beside the hero-shrine of Khalkodon, (the gate) that is now called the Peiraieus gate. And on this front they were overpowered by the women and forced to yield as far as the shrine of the Eumenides, but on the right, attacking from the Palladion, Ardetos and the Lykeion, they thrust them back right to their camp and struck many of them down. (He says) that in the fourth month a treaty was arranged through the agency of Hippolyta (for Hippolyta is the name he gives to the Amazon who lived with Theseus, not Antiope). But some say... (7). However, proof that the war ended in a treaty is (provided) both by the name of the place beside the Theseion, (the place) that they call the Horkomosion ('place of the oath'), and by the ancient sacrifice to the Amazons before the Theseia.

Commentary

The story of Theseus' rape of an Amazon woman was a feature of his myth from the early sixth century. It was perhaps created on the analogy of a similar exploit by Herakles (Hippolyta's girdle). In the original version the Amazon's name was probably Antiope, based upon the evidence of red-figure vase-painting and Pindar fr. 175, and Pausanias reported seeing a monument to Antiope just inside the entrance to the city on the way from Phaleron (1.2.1). But as early an author as Simonides of Keos (in Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*, Epitome 1.15) gave the alternative, Hippolyta. The fifth-century dramatists (certainly Euripides, perhaps Sophokles) adopted the latter in order to incorporate the Hippolytos myth. That version affected Kleidemos (#75) and Istros (#80), but was rejected by Philokhoros (#73), who, however, gave an account similar to that of the unknown author Hegias of Troizen (Pausanias: 1.2.1), according to which Antiope was a prize of honour (*geras*) instead of a victim of rape, won by Theseus when he was part of Herakles' expedition to Hippolyta, not on his own independent expedition (see Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*, Epitome 1.15). This version seems designed to moderate Theseus' reputation for violence and did not impress Plutarch.

That Hellanikos was the only Atthidographer to be cited for observations on the nature of the Amazons and their homeland (#72b, #74a, b, c) may not be entirely fortuitous. As a product of Ionian science he was more like Hekataios and Herodotos in the breadth of his interests. Jacoby (*Text*: 38) compares his explanation that they cauterized their breast to a similar point made about Sauromatian women by Hippokrates (*On Airs, Waters, Places*: 17) and is of the opinion that Hellanikos based his theory that they crossed the Kimmerian Bosphoros when it was frozen upon Herodotos' description of the Skythians doing the same thing (4.28). The most detailed reflection of ancient speculation about the Amazons is in Diodoros (2.45–6). Modern opinions are no less imaginative (e.g. Tyrrell 1984) and persistent (Blok 1995).

Hellanikos' theory about the way the Amazons crossed into Europe from their home in Pontos on the Thermodon river leads to the next part of the discussion – the supposed invasion of Attika by an army of Amazons. This is a purely Athenian conceit, that may well have become part of national propaganda already by the time of the Persian War, if we can believe Herodotos, who makes the Athenians invoke

their defeat of the Amazon invasion as part of their claim to priority over the Tegeans in the line-up for the battle of Plataia (9.27.1–5). But this reference could be anachronistic. At any rate, it was after the war that the Amazonomachy became popular in both art and literature as a mythical prefiguration of Athens' part in defeating the Persians and (together with the Centauromachy) a symbolic representation of the triumph of civilization (Athens) over barbarism (alien cultures). It was depicted in the Theseion, a sanctuary dedicated to Theseus by Kimon in the 470s (see note on #298 in [Appendix 1](#)), after he had brought back his bones from Skyros (Pausanias: 1.17.4–6). It appeared later in the Stoa Poikile as a foil to the battle of Marathon and was represented on the metopes of the Parthenon and the shield of Athena Parthenos. It subsequently became one of the most cited instances of Athens' service to Hellenism in the hands of the orators in the genre of the *epitaphios* (see Lysias: 2.4–6; Isokrates: 4.68–70; Plato, *Menexenos*: 239b). It was also known to Aiskhylos (*Eumenides*: 685–90), who added the idea that the invasion was 'in resentment against Theseus'. Thus, as early as the 450s a connection had been made between Theseus' expedition to the Amazons and their subsequent return of the compliment – a doublet of the motif of Theseus' violence toward women leading to attack upon Attika that is found in the story of his rape of Helen and the response of the Dioskouroi (#76c). Aiskhylos also provided some topographical detail for the battle, locating the Amazon camp upon the Areiopagos. That, of course, was simply to justify his original etymology of the name. The fragment of Kleidemos (#75) shows how far that sort of pseudorealism could be taken. Plutarch's way of referring to Kleidemos suggests that once again his version was distinctive. Nevertheless, this passage (as well as the reference to the monuments to Antiope and Molpaidia in Pausanias: 1.2.1) shows that fourth-century Athenians could identify memorials to the Amazons in their topography and reveals the use made of this 'evidence' by the Atthidographers in their research. It is important to remember that written records were not the only sources of information available for those who wanted to recreate the story of Athens' past.

Theseus and women

76a. Hellanikos F18 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F168a) = Plutarch, *Theseus* 31: He (sc. Theseus) was already 50 years old when he was involved in the assault upon Helen when she was still under age. For that reason some say.... But the most likely account and the one with the most supporters, is as follows: The two of them (sc. Theseus and Peirithous) went together to Sparta, grabbed the young girl (sc. Helen) as she was dancing in the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, and ran off. And, since those who were sent in pursuit did not follow them any further than Tegea, they made their way in safety out of the Peloponnese. Then they came to an agreement that whichever one of them drew Helen as his lot would marry her, but he would help the other one get another wife. On these terms they drew lots and Theseus won. Thereupon he took the maid, who was not yet of an age to marry, and carried her off to Aphidna, where he put her in his mother's care and entrusted both to Aphidnos, who was his friend, with instructions to keep guard over them with utmost secrecy. Then, in return for the assistance of Peirithous, he went away with him to Epeiros, in search of the daughter of Aidoneus, king of the Molossians. This king had given the name Persephone to his wife, Kore to his daughter and Kerberos to his dog, and made it a requirement that those who sought the hand of his daughter fight with this dog. The one who overcame it would take her. When, however, he found out that Peirithous and company had not come to woo but to rape, he arrested them and let the dog dispose of Peirithous right away. But Theseus he kept locked up.

76b. Hellanikos F19 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F168b) = Scholion to Lykophron, *Alexandra* 513: Hellanikos says that Helen was seven years old when she was raped by Theseus.

76c. Hellanikos F20 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F168c) = Scholion A, D to Homer, *Iliad* 3.144. Homer, *Iliad* 3.143–4: 'She (sc. Helen) was accompanied by two maidservants, Aithra daughter of Pittheus and Klymene the ox-eyed'. Scholion: This Aithra is different from the mother of Theseus. For it is disgraceful for Aithra to attend Helen in the manner of a servant, since she was considered to be her mother-in-law. For, as Hellanikos records, Peirithous and Theseus, the one a son of Zeus, the other of Poseidon, made an agreement that they

would marry daughters of Zeus. First they took Helen and, since she was too young, they set her aside at Aphidna in Attike with Aithra, the daughter of Pittheus, who was Theseus' mother. So, they turn up in Hades' in search of Persephone. But the Dioskouroi (sc. Kastor and Polydeukes), lay waste to Attike until they received their sister back, and they take Aithra prisoner.

77. Phanodemos F27 = Scholion to Hesiod, *Theogony* 913–14 ('She bore white-armed Persephone, whom Aidoneus snatched away from her mother, a gift of cunning Zeus'): Some say that Persephone was abducted from Sicily, Bakkhylides (says) from Krete, Orpheus from the region around Okeanos, **Phanodemos from Attika**, Demeas (?) in glens (?).

78a. Philokhoros F18a = Plutarch, *Theseus* 35: When Aidoneus the Molossian was entertaining Herakles and happened to mention the affair of Theseus and Peirithous, both what they had come to do and what they had suffered after they had been caught, Herakles was distressed (to hear how) the one (sc. Peirithous) had perished in disgrace and the other (sc. Theseus) was about to die. In the case of Peirithous he realized that he would gain nothing by making accusations, but he did take up the case of Theseus and begged that he be given to him as a favour. Aidoneus agreed and Theseus was set free, whereupon he returned to Athens, where his supporters were not yet completely out of power. He proceeded to dedicate to Herakles all the existing sacred places that the city had previously chosen out for him and changed the name of all Theseia to Herakleia, **with the exception of four, as Philokhoros says in his history.**

78b. Philokhoros F18b = Georgios Synkellos (Eusebios), *Ekloge Chronographias* (Mosshammer) 299, (Adler and Tuffin, 229): The rape of the maid Persephone by Aidoneus, king of the Molossians, who had an extra-large dog, nicknamed Kerberos, by means of which on a later occasion he did away with Peirithous, who had come (to Molossia) together with Theseus to abduct his (sc. Aidoneus') wife (sc. Persephone). When Theseus was on the point of being put to death along with Peirithous, Herakles chanced to meet him and saved him. **It is considered that Theseus returned from Hades' because of the manifest danger he faced, as Philokhoros records in the second (book) of Atthis.**

78c. Philokhoros F18c = Boccaccio, *Genealogia deorum gentilium* 11.6: **On the authority of Philokhoros, I think therefore that she (i.e. Persephone) was the daughter of Sycanus, king of Sicily, and Ceres, and that she was abducted by Orcus, king of the Molossians, or by Cydonius (?) or Agesilaos, and joined to him as wife in the 28th year of the reign of Ericeus, king of Athens.**

79. Istros F7 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 34.3: **Istros in the thirteenth**

(book) of his *Attika* reports an original and entirely extraordinary story about Aithra (the mother of Theseus), saying that according to some accounts Alexandros (Paris) was overcome by Akhilleus and Patroklos in a battle beside the Sperkheios river, but that Hektor captured the city of Troizen, plundered it and carried off Aithra, who had been left behind there. But this is a very illogical account.

80. Istros F10 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 13.4, p. 556f–7b: Aigeus also had many wives. He married <Melite> first, the daughter of Hoples, after her <Khalkiope>, one of the daughters of Khalkodon. He handed both of these over to his friends and associated with a great number of women outside of wedlock. Later he took Aithra, the daughter of Pittheus, and after her Medeia. And Theseus, after abducting Helen, went right on to rape Ariadne. **At any rate, Istros in the fourteenth (book) of the *Attika* gives a list of Theseus' women and says that he acquired some of them [out of love], [some] by abduction and yet others through lawful marriage. By abduction he acquired Helen, Ariadne, Hippolyte and the daughters of Kerkyon and Sinis, but he entered into lawful union with Meliboia, the mother of Aias.** Hesiod (F298) mentions both Hippe and Aigle, on whose account he broke the oaths he swore to Ariadne, as Kerkops says. And Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3 F153; Fowler, *Pherekydes* F153) adds also Phereboia. **And before Helen he also raped Anaxo from Troizen. After Hippolyte he married Phaidra.**

Commentary

No fragments show more clearly the independence of the Attidographers from the nationalist propaganda promoted by the dramatists and the orators than these, which reveal that from Hellanikos (#76a–c) to Istros (#80, at least; the material attributed to him in #79 is, as Plutarch remarks, illogical, but see Jacoby, *Text*: 633–4) they rejected any attempt to whitewash his reputation for violence against women (cf. Plutarch, *Theseus*: 29.1–2). The most discreditable story is also the oldest, namely that of his rape of Helen. It was known to the writers of epic and the early lyric poets (see e.g. Mills 1997:7–13). Hellanikos, especially, seems to have enjoyed pointing out the extreme disparity in age of the violator (50) and the victim (7). This irresponsible act led to the invasion of Attika by Helen's brothers, who rescued her and captured Theseus' mother, while Theseus was away trying to abduct another woman (Persephone, whose own rape the ever patriotic Phanodemos placed in Attika in F27, #77) for his partner in crime, Peirithous (their friendship is the theme of Plutarch, *Theseus*: 30–1). The result of that exploit only added to his disgrace, since he was imprisoned and only escaped by being set free by Herakles. In a manner typical of our genre Hellanikos modernized the story, by humanizing all the participants and rationalizing the action. To judge from both Plutarch and Georgios Synkellos, Philokhoros appears to have followed Hellanikos closely (Boccaccio's citation at #78c is aberrant, as usual), though the notion that Theseus returned 'from Hades' in #78b is troubling. But Philokhoros did manage to twist the story to reflect some credit upon Theseus, by suggesting that he was gracious enough to re-dedicate all except four of his sacred places to Herakles in gratitude to him for saving his life. This, of course, was a reversal of the truth, since Herakles was by far the more popular hero in Attic art and cult until close to the end of the sixth century, after which he was gradually displaced in art and literature by the intrusive influence of Theseus (Mills 1997:25–9; Parker 1996:169), though he never lost his greater significance in cult.

Theseus protector of suppliants

81. Androtion F62 = Scholion (V) to Homer, *Odyssey* 11.271.

Homer, *Odyssey* 11.271: And I saw the mother of Oidipodes, beautiful Epikaste.... Scholion: Laios, father of Oidipous, after receiving an oracular response from Phoibos to the effect that his son would kill him, marries Epikaste, begets Oidipous, and exposes him. Sicyonian horse-keepers rescued him and brought him up. When he reached manhood, Oidipous went to Thebes in search of his parents.

Unintentionally he killed his father and unknowing he married his mother, after solving the Sphinx's riddle that ran, 'What is two-footed, what three-footed, what four-footed?' Children of these (Oidipous and Epikaste) were Eteokles and Polyneikes, and the daughters, Antigone and Ismene. **Later, Iokaste (sic) realized that she had made love to her son and hung herself, and Oidipous, exiled by Kreon, came to Attika and lived in (the place) called Kolonos Hippeus. And he became a suppliant in the sanctuary of the goddess Demeter and Athena, city-holder, and, when he was being dragged off forcibly by Kreon, found a protector in Theseus. As he was dying of old age Oidipous begged Theseus not to show his grave to any Theban. For (they) wanted to do him harm even as a corpse. The story is in Androtion.**

82. Phanodemos F26 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1239 ('Learning the story of Admetos, my friend, love good men...'): **Ammonios (FGrHist: 350 F2) says that Phanodemos recounts that Admetos came as a refugee from Pherai to Theseus, (bringing) with (him) Alkestis and Hippasos, the youngest of his children, and settled with him (sc. Theseus) in his territory.** That is the point of the scholion.

83. Philokhoros F112 = Plutarch, *Theseus* 29.4: And Theseus helped Adrastus bring about the recovery of the bodies of those who fell in battle beneath the Kadmeia, but not in the way Euripides has portrayed it (*Suppliants*: 566ff.; 635ff.), by overcoming the Thebans in battle, but rather through a negotiated truce. **And Philokhoros says that this was also the first treaty for the recovery of corpses.**

84. Philokhoros F113 = Strabo 9.2.11 C404 (on the place-name 'Harma' = chariot): Regarding the Harma in Boiotia, some say that, when in the fighting Amphiaraios fell out of his chariot (harma) on the spot where now his sanctuary is located, his empty chariot was

brought to the place that bears its name. But others say that it was Adrastos' chariot that was shattered as he was fleeing there, but that he was saved by Areion (his horse). **Philokhoros, however, says that he was saved by the people of the village, who for that reason have received the privilege of equal political rights (*isopoliteia*) from the Argives.**

NB See also #298 in [Appendix 1](#).

Commentary

Though the theme of Athens' reputation as the city where outcasts could find refuge and justice first appears in Herodotos (9.27.2–4), it was assiduously nurtured by the dramatists and adopted by the orators in the *epitaphios* (see Lysias: 2.7–16; Isokrates: 4.54–60; Plato, *Menexenos*: 239b). Orestes, Oidipous, Adrastos, Herakles and his descendants are all examples of suppliants who received the generosity of her protection. Phanodemos' claim that Admetos belonged in the list (#82) is unattested. The difference between the two genres was that, while oratory generalized the act into a gift by all Athenians, drama personalized the protector. In drama, Orestes was saved by Athena herself through the agency of the Areiopagos in Aiskhylos' *Oresteia*; but the medium in the other cases was usually Theseus. His generous reception of Oidipous appears in Sophokles' *Oidipous at Kolonos* and this may be the occasion for Androtion's summary of the myth in #81 (see *Androtion*: 192 and see, in general, Mills 1997:160–85). By far the most prolific exploiter of this tradition was Euripides in his plays *Suppliants* (Adrastos; see Mills 1997:87–128) and *Herakles* (Mills 1997:129–59), though it is Theseus' son, Demophon, to whom he assigns the role of protector of the Herakleidai in the play of the same name. Though we have no fragments related to the Herakles story, two fragments from Philokhoros do touch upon Adrastos.

In #83 we find that he rejected Euripides' version that Theseus led a military campaign against the Thebans and turned his intervention into that of a negotiator of a treaty (in fact, he made him into its *protos heuretes*) for the recovery of the dead. This different account once again shows that the Atthidographers were not slaves to patriotic tradition. At the same time, in this case it probably also reflects Athens' altered role in international affairs in Philokhoros' time. #84 must be part of a narrative of Adrastos' flight from Thebes to Attika, during which his chariot (*harma*) broke. The incident was used by two villages, one Boiotian, the other Attic, to explain their name. The story demonstrates how intensely Greek communities vied for the right to use mythical material. Exactly how Philokhoros incorporated this much detail into his chronicle is unclear, but see the discussion in Jacoby (*Text*: 442–8). As an Athenian he naturally favoured the claims of the Attic village over the Boiotian. We can be confident of the existence in his day of isopolity between Argos and the Attic village

and deduce that that was the starting point for his research.

Exile of Theseus

85. Philokhoros F19 = *Etymologicum Magnum* p. 140.45: Aretesion: (This is) a place at Athens, so named because that is where Theseus cursed his enemies, when he had been expelled from Athens after his return from Hades'. For the place got its name, Aretesion, from the curses (arai). That is the way Philokhoros explains it in the second (book) of the *Atthides*.

Commentary

Once again a known topographical reference, the Aretesion (or Araterion in Plutarch, *Theseus*: 35.5, whose account is shown by this fragment to be taken from Philokhoros), became the basis for a story and was attracted (rightly or wrongly) into the Theseus narrative. The tradition that Theseus cursed the Athenians before he left for Skyros after being expelled from power implies that he left his monarchy unwillingly. This is in conflict with other versions (i.e. Euripides, *Suppliants*: 403–8; Isokrates: 15.129; Dem.: 59.75; *MP*, epoch 20; Plutarch, *Theseus*: 24.2), which suggest that he stepped down from his monarchy voluntarily, after creating the democratic constitution to one degree or another through his *synoikismos*. Aristotle probably hints at something similar (*Athēnaion Politeia*: 41.2, fr. 2; cf. Herakleides, epitome, 1. See Rhodes, *Commentary*: 484–5). By contrast, Thukydides (2.15.1) treats his *synoikismos* as a unification of the kingdom under himself as monarch. This is probably the view taken by most writers of the *Atthis*, not least Philokhoros, for whom the *synoikismos* was an improvement on the former situation, under which Attika was divided into the 12 towns of Kekrops (F94 = #8). They probably also considered it a necessary response to the artificial division of the kingdom into four parts under Pandion, which they had created. Only the atthidographic source of *MP*, whichever it was, is known to have associated the *synoikismos* with democracy. See Jacoby, *Text*: 309–12.

4

TROJAN WAR TO THE END OF THE MONARCHY

Menestheus

Kastor: Menestheus, son of Peteos the son of Orneos the son of Erekhtheus, 23 years (1205/4–1183/2), under whom Ilion was taken.

MP, epoch 23 (1218/17): From the time when the [Helle]nes went on campaign against Troy, 954 years, when [Men]estheus was in his 13th years as king of Athe[ns].

MP, epoch 24 (1209/8): From the time when Troy was captured, 945 years, when [Menesthe]us was in his [2]2nd year as king of Athens, on the 24th day of the month [Thargelio]n.

86a. Hellanikos F21a (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F143) = Scholion to Euripides, *Hekabe* 123: ‘The two sons of Theseus, scions of Athens’. Some say the sons of Theseus did not go on campaign to Ilion as commanders nor as members of the alliance, but to get back Aithra. For that reason Homer says that Menestheus was leader of the Athenians (*Iliad*: 2.552). At any rate, Dionysios who wrote the *Kyklos* says: ‘Demophon the son of Theseus was asking them to hand over Aithra, daughter of Pittheus, his father’s mother, so that he could convey her home. And Menelaos sends Talthybios to Helen with orders to bring Aithra, and Helen, after presenting Aithra with all sorts of finery, sends her back to Demophon and Akamas’. **But Hellanikos says that they went on campaign with the intention that, if they captured Ilion they would get her as a prize of war, but if not they would ransom her with gifts. (He says) that they were in exile on account of the fact that they were not willing to be ruled by Menestheus. And they were in Euboia with [Elephenor] the son of Khalkodon the son of Abas.**

86b. Hellanikos F21b (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F152)/The writers of the *Atthides* F3 = Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1.104.2: Ilion was captured in the eighteenth year of the reign of Agamemnon, in the first year of the rule of Demophon son of Theseus, on the 12th of the month Thargelion, as says Dionysios the Argive (*FGrHist*: 308 F1).... **Hellanikos (says that Troy was captured) on the 12th day of the month Thargelion. And some of the writers of the *Atthides* (say Troy was captured) on the 23rd, in the last year of the reign of Menestheus, when the moon was full – ‘it was the middle of the night’, says the author of the *The Little Iliad*, ‘and a bright moon was rising...’. But others say (Troy was captured) on the same day**

of the month Skirophorion.

86c. Hellanikos F21c (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F152) = Tzetzes, *Posthomerica* 770: It was the twelfth day of the month Thargelion...it was the middle of the night and a bright moon was rising...Kallisto was priestess in famous Athens...in that hour, on that night, as the Lesbian Hellanikos sings (and Douris with him) the Akhaian host took Troy.

Commentary

We do not have any fragment that specifically relates to Menestheus, though it is hardly likely that he was ignored by the *Atthis*. Not only is his reign listed by the chronographers (above), but he was too well-known as the leader of the Athenian contingent at Troy from Homer's *Iliad* (2.552). Anyway, reading between the lines of Hellanikos F21a, we can perceive that his account cannot have been very different from that found in Plutarch, *Theseus*: 32–5, and elsewhere (cf. Pausanias: 1.17.5–6; Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*, Epitome, 1.23–4; Diod.: 4.63.4). So, we may assume that he explained the presence of Aithra daughter of Pittheus as a servant of Helen in the *Iliad* (3.144) by her capture by the Dioskouroi, and the exile of Demophon and Akamas to Elephenor in Euboia (whether Theseus sent them there or they went of their own accord) by the ejection of Theseus through the machinations of Menestheus. In this story, we can perhaps see how a figure in the tradition (i.e. Menestheus), who may have had better credentials to be king through his descent from Erekhtheus (Plutarch, *Theseus*: 31.1; Pausanias: 2.25.6; Kastor, above; Jacoby, *Text*: 41), can be cast into the role of evil usurper as a result of the development of the Theseus myth. On the other hand, Menestheus is an odd figure, who has no known cult and plays little part in the story of Athens (see Kearns 1989:185), except his mention in Homer and his discreditable part in the demise of the national hero. One could almost believe that he was intruded in order to explain why Theseus was not at Troy, since he apparently did not return from Troy and was succeeded on the throne by Demophon, son of Theseus (see below).

For discussion of the amazing precision in the dispute over the exact day on which Troy fell see Jacoby, *Text*: 596–7, and for speculation on Hellanikos' date for the event, *Text*: 42. For the methods of the chronographers in general see Mosshammer (1979:84–168).

Demophon

Kastor: Demophon, son of Theseus, 33 years (1183/2–1150/49).

MP, epoch 25 (1208/7): From the time when [a trial was held] on the Areiopagos [for] Oreste[s...and Erig]on[e], daughter of [A]igisthos, [concerning Ai]gisthos and [Kl]y[tainnestra], (a trial) which Orestes won, [since] the [votes were equal], 942 or 944 years, when Demophon was king of Athens.

MP, epoch 26 (1201/0): From the time when Teukros founded [Salamis in] Kypros, 938 years, when Demophon was king of Athens.

87. Kleidemos F20/Phanodemos F16 = Souda s.v. epi Palladio (Eustathios on Homer, *Odyssey* 1.325–7, p. 1419.52): According to Pausanias the *ephetai* used to judge cases of unintentional homicide there. For the Argives (he says), when they put in at Phaleron on their way sailing back from Ilion, were done away with by the Athenians out of ignorance of who they were. Later, when Akamas learned about this and when the Palladion that was being searched for had been found, they established a lawcourt at that place on the bidding of an oracle, as Phanodemos says. But Kleitodemos says that when Agamemnon put in at Athens with the Palladion, Demophon snatched the Palladion and killed many of the men who were pursuing him. When Agamemnon became angry, they subjected themselves to trial at the hands of fifty Athenians and the same number of Argives. These men were called *ephetai*, on account of the fact that both parties appealed to them for the decision. And the lawcourt was named for Pallas.

88. Phanodemos F11 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 10.49 p. 437cd: Phanodemos says that Demophon the king, when he was about to celebrate the festival of the Khoes at Athens (lacuna), wishing to be hospitable to Orestes who had arrived at Athens. Not wanting him to approach the sacred places nor to be a participant in the libations, since his trial had not yet taken place, he ordered the sanctuaries to be shut and a jug (Khous) of wine to be handed out to each (worshipper), proclaiming that a cake would be given as a prize to the first person to drain (his jug). He also issued an order that when they had stopped drinking they should not place the crowns, which they had been wearing, at the sanctuaries on account of the fact that they had been under the same roof as

Orestes, but instead each person should put his crown around his own jug and take it off to the sanctuary *In Limnai* (and give it) to the priestess, then, for the future, to make sacrifice in the sanctuary. Since that time the festival has been called Khoes (Jugs).

Commentary

Demophon is often found (as in #86a above) paired with his brother Akamas, who became eponym of one of the Kleisthenian tribes, Akamantis. These two may possibly have been worshipped together at Phaleron in a cluster of religious sites closely associated with Theseus (Pausanias: 1.1.4; Kearns 1989:38–40, 143–4, 155). They are also confused in our sources as father of Mounitos by Laodike daughter of Priam (Demophon in Plutarch, *Theseus*: 34.2; Akamas in Lykophron: 495–8 and Hegesippos, *FGrHist*: 391 F4) and as husband of Phyllis daughter of the king of the Bisaltoï in Thrace, upon which fictitious union Athens based her specious claim to the region of Ennea Hodoi and Amphipolis (see Aiskhines: 2.31, where Akamas is the husband of Phyllis, but in the scholion to that passage Demophon is named as the father by Phyllis of Akamas and Amphipolis!). They were possibly also confused with one another in the story of the Palladion (#87). Their non-involvement in the fighting at Troy was justified by the sympathetic tale of their desire to rescue their grandmother.

Two important traditions are associated with the reign of Demophon, both of which are related to Athenian homicide procedure, though one (#88) serves the additional function of explaining a customary ritual that took place on the second day of the *Antheateria*. For obvious reasons the trial of Orestes was dated to the reign of the first king after the Trojan War (see above #30a–b), usually considered to be Demophon, and this date was consistently adhered to, as is shown by the story in Phanodemos F11 (#88) and the reference in *MP*, epoch 25. Phanodemos was probably responsible for adding the information that the presence of Orestes, polluted with blood, in Athens at the time of the *Antheateria* prompted Demophon to devise the ritual that took place on the second day of the festival, the day called *Khoes* (see Parke 1977:107–20, especially, 113–16). The same *aition* also appears in a scholion to Euripides, *Iphigeneia in Tauris*: 942. The suggestion that this all happened in Pandion's reign (which appears to be attributed to Apollodoros, *FGrHist*: 244 F133, in a scholion to Aristophanes, *Akharnians*: 961) is probably the result of confusion on the part of the scholiast (Jacoby, *Text*: 184–5).

#87 offers an *aition* from Phanodemos for the court 'at the Palladion', which tried unwilling (*akousios*) homicide, combined with an explanation (of sorts) from Kleidemos of the name of the *ephetai*, the obscure Athenian jury that judged homicide cases in three out of

the five homicide courts (the Delphinion, the 'in Phreatto' as well as the 'at the Palladion'), and which was in existence from, at least, the time of Drakon (*IG*, 1³: 104.17).

Other important sources for the court 'at the Palladion' are Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 57.3; Pausanias: 1.8.9, 2.23.5; Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 8.118; Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. 'epi Palladio', scholia on Aiskhines, 2. 87 and Demosthenes, 23.27; and the *Lexikon rhetoricum* p. 311.3, s.v. 'epi palladio'.

These sources disagree on many details. For example, Phanodemos' account is quite impersonal, stating that the Palladion was brought by unidentified Argives, who were killed by unnamed Athenians. In this he is followed by Pollux and the scholion on Aiskhines. Others name the leader of the Argives as Agamemnon (e.g. Kleidemos, here, and Harpokration) or Diomedes (Pausanias, the scholion on Demosthenes and the *Lexikon rhetoricum*). Again, some specify that the leader of the Athenians who were guilty of the unwilling homicide and the one who later, when he realized his crime, set up a sacred space for the Palladion and the court there, was Demophon, the king (Kleidemos, here, Pausanias, Harpokration, the scholion on Demosthenes and the *Lexikon rhetoricum*). Some, however, involve Akamas in the action, though usually as the person who recognized the wrongdoing and set up the shrine and the court outside it as a recompense, never as the killer or as king (Phanodemos, here, Pollux and the scholion to Aiskhines). Regardless, all agree on ascribing the establishment of that court, which must have been located outside an as yet undiscovered temple of Pallas Athena, somewhere outside the city on the road to Phaleron, to some accidental killing of people carrying the Palladion (regarding which see Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.12.3, epitome 5.10–13; Pausanias: 2.23.5) from Troy. On the court 'at the Palladion' see MacDowell 1963:58–69.

As for Kleidemos' account of the establishment of the *ephetai*, the most charitable approach is to accept Jacoby's judgement that its faults lie with the excerptors, not the Atthidographer (*Text*: 79–81). The best ancient information about them dates their institution to the time of Drakon (Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 8.125; cf. *IG*, 1³: 104.17) and fixes their number at 51. See MacDowell 1963:48–57; Wallace 1985:11–22; Carawan 1991:1–16; *Androton*: 85–90; and the discussion above under 'Areiopagos'.

Oxyntes

Kastor: Oxyntes, son of Demophon, 15 years (1150/49–1136/5).

Apheidas

Kastor: Apeidas, son of Oxyntes, 1 year (1136/5–1135/4).

Thymoites

Kastor: Thymoites, brother of Apeidas, 8 years (1135/4–1127/6).

Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias* p. 335 (Mosshammer); Adler and Tuffin, p. 208: Thymoites, brother of Apeidas, was the 15th king of the Athenians; he ruled for 9 years, 4365 anno mundi. During his time the monarchy of the Erekhtheidai, called the Attic monarchy amongst the Athenians, was ended and went over to another family. For, when Xanthios the Boiotian called Thymoites out to battle and Thymoites refused, Melanthos son of Andropompos from Pylos took up the challenge, fought the duel, won the battle and became king. As a result the festival of the Apatouria is celebrated at Athens, because the victory was won through a deception (*apate*).

Commentary

These were the last three names assigned to the dynasty of Erekhtheus. Both Apheidas and Thymoites were eponyms of historical subsets (Apheidantidai, Thymaitis and Thymaitadai) of the Athenian population, of which the first two were either *gene*, or more probably phratries (*IG*, II²: 1597.19–21; Lambert 1993:363; Parker 1996:319 and see on the Medontidai below) and the last was a coastal deme of the tribe Hippothontis (Traill 1975:52). There is, however, no entry on any of these kings in the *Marmor Parium*, nor are any details about their reigns recorded in the *Atthis*, with the exception of two traditions about Thymoites, that he assassinated his brother Apheidas (on whom see also Pausanias: 7.25.1) and that he offered up the kingdom to anyone willing to fight single-handed against the Boiotian king Xanthios, which was used to explain the transfer of rule to the Melanthids (or Medontids). These stories are contained in the fragments from Demon and Hellanikos that are discussed next. No cults are recorded for these names (Kearns 1989:151, 170).

Melanthos

Kastor: Melanthos, son of Andropompos, the Pylian, 37 years (1127/6–1090/89).

Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias* p. 335 (Mosshammer); Adler and Tuffin, p. 208: Melanthos, son of Andropompos, the Pylian was the 16th king of the Athenians; he ruled for 37 years, (beginning) 4374 anno mundi.

Kodros

Kastor: Kodros, son of Melanthos, 21 years (1090/89–1070/69).

Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias* p. 335 (Mosshammer); Adler and Tuffin, pp. 208–9: Kodros, son of Melanthos, was the 17th king of the Athenians; he ruled for 21 years, (beginning) 4411 anno mundi. In his time the return of the Herakleidai took place, and the Ionians fled to take refuge at Athens, after being expelled from Akhaia. The Peloponnesians campaigned against Athens, for whom (i.e. the Athenians) Kodros, son of Melanthos, sacrificed himself in accordance with an oracle. After that the Athenians no longer had kings, but lifelong rulers instead.

Medon

Kastor: Medon, son of Kodros, 20 years (1070/69–1049/8).

MP, epoch 27 (10[8]6/5): From the time when Ne[leus] founded [Mile]t[os and all the rest of Ioni]a – Ephesos, Erythrai, Klazomenai, [Pri]en[e, Lebed]os, [Teos], Kolophon, [M]yous, [Phok]a[ia], Samos, [Khios - and] the [Pan]ioni[a] came into existence, [82]3 years, when Me<don> (Menestheus in text) was in his 13th year as king of Athens.

Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias* p. 335 (Mosshammer); Adler and Tuffin, p. 209: Medon, son of Kodros, was the 18th king of the Athenians; he ruled for 20 years, (beginning) 4432 anno mundi. He is the first of the so-called ‘lifelong rulers’ among the Athenians.

89. Hellanikos F23 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F125) = Scholion T to Plato, *Symposion* 208D (‘...that Kodros would have sacrificed his life to save the kingship for his sons...’): **Kodros was descended from Deukalion, according to Hellanikos. For Hellen is the son of Deukalion and Pyrrha, or as some say Zeus and Pyrrha. And the children of Hellen and Othreis are Xouthos, Aiolos, Doros and Xenopatra. Salmoneus is the son of Aiolos and Iphis the daughter of Peneios. And Salmoneus and Alkidike have Tyro, whose child by Poseidon is Neleus. Periklymenos is the son of Neleus and Khloris, and his son by Peisidike is Boros. Boros and Lysidike have Penthilos, whose son by Ankhirrhoe is Andropompos. The son of Andropompos by Heniokhe the daughter of Armenios, son of Xeuxippos, son of Eumelos, son of Admetos, is Melanthos. On the incursion of the Herakleidai this man (i.e. Melanthos) retreated from Messene to Athens, and his son is Kodros.**

Some time later a dispute arose between the Boiotians and the Athenians over Oinoe and Panakton, according to some, others say it was for Melainai. When the Boiotians were demanding that the kings fight for the territory between themselves in a duel, Xanthios king of the Boiotians accepted, but Thymoites king of the Athenians refused, announcing that he would surrender his kingdom to anyone who was willing to fight the duel. Melanthos took on the challenge, on the condition that he and his descendants would be kings of the Athenians, and went forth to battle fully armed. Now, when he was close to Xanthios, he said, ‘Xanthios,

you are in the wrong by coming out against me with a companion and not alone as was agreed'. When Xanthios heard this, he turned around with the intention of seeing whether anyone had accompanied him and, once he had turned, Melanthos struck him and killed him. Thus he became king of the Athenians. As a result of this it was decreed by the Athenians, after they gained control of the (disputed) territory, to celebrate a festival, which originally they called Apatenoria, because it got its name from the deception (*apate*) that was perpetrated, though later they called it Apatouria.

Kodros was the son of Melanthos and succeeded to the throne. He sacrificed his life for his country in the following manner: At a time when there was a state of war between the Dorians and the Athenians, a divine oracle had predicted to the Dorians that they would capture Athens, provided they did not kill Kodros the king. When he learned this, Kodros dressed himself in a cheap outfit as a woodcutter and advanced to the enemy palisade with a pruning knife in hand. Two of the enemy came out to oppose him, of whom he struck and killed one. He himself, however, was killed by a blow from the other, who was unaware who he was. He left the throne to the older of his sons, Medon, while his younger son, Neleus, became founder of the twelve cities of Ionia. Whence the story goes that the nobility of the Kodridai became proverbial amongst the Athenians and 'nobler than Kodros' came to signify men of exceeding excellence.

90. Hellanikos F11 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F48) = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Erythrians: Demosthenes (mentions this) in the eighth *Philippic* (8.24). Erythra was a city in Ionia, one of those founded by Neleus son of Kodros, as Hellanikos says in *Atthis*.

91. Demon F1 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 3.50 p. 96DE:
'Demon in (book) four of *Atthis* says: Apheidas the king of Athens was killed by his younger brother Thymoites, who took over the throne, though he was illegitimate. In his reign Melanthos the Messenian, who had been ejected from his native land, consulted the Pythia with the question, where he should settle down. She answered, 'Wherever he was first honoured with gifts of hospitality, by people who placed in front of him the feet and the head.' And he experienced this (hospitality) in Eleusis. For when the priestesses were celebrating at that time an ancestral festival and they had used up all the meat, so that only the head and feet were left, they sent these to Melanthos.'

Commentary

The tradition was well established by the time of Herodotos (5.65.3) that Melanthos and Kodros came to Athens as refugees from Pylos and founded a new dynasty. They had apparently been driven out of Messenia by the Herakleidai (see Pausanias: 2.18.7–8; Strabo: 9.1.7.C393). Precisely when, or by whom, this explanation for the presence of the Melanthid dynasty in Athens was created, is uncertain, though one element in their history (i. e. the peculiar style of Kodros' self-sacrifice) was known to the early historian Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3 F154 = Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 10.128). Anyway, after Hellanikos (at least) the tale of Thymoites' unwillingness to accept Xanthios' (Xanthos in Strabo: 9.1.7.C393) challenge became virtually canonical (though see Pausanias: 2.18.9 for the view that Melanthos killed Thymoites). Demon was probably responsible for the additional details about Melanthos' consultation of the oracle at Delphi and the omen he was given there about how to find his new home (cf. his similar account of the Boiotian search for a home in Didymos, *On Demosthenes*: col. 11.66–col. 12.33, for which see *Didymos*: 84–7, 228–30). That Demon was also the source of the account of the assassination of Apeidas by Thymoites is less certain.

Later, a branch of the family, headed by Neleus son of Kodros (or Androkles son of Kodros in Pherekydes, *FGrHist*: 3 F155), was believed by Ionian tradition to have led the migration of refugees from Attika to Asia Minor to found the Ionian dodekapolis (for details see Strabo: 14.1–4 C632–3 and, especially, Pausanias: 7.2–4). Given his origin in Lesbos, Hellanikos was undoubtedly aware of this Ionian tradition, but he also found it affirmed by the Athenians, who claimed from at least the time of Solon to be the metropolis of the Ionian cities (Solon F4 Diehl). Herodotos, too, subscribed to the view that the Ionians had emigrated from Attika (1.142–8). The general outline of this traditional tale of refugees from the Peloponnese fleeing to Attika after the collapse of the Mykenaiian kingdoms and subsequently migrating across the Aegean to Asia Minor in the late eleventh and early tenth century, though easily seen as an imperialistic invention by the Athenians either in the time of Peisistratos or in the fifth century, is not inconsistent with the archaeological record (Cook 1962:11–13; *CAH*³ 2.2:782–804; Desborough 1972:354–5).

Some famous (or infamous) Athenian families were thought (or claimed) to be descended from this dynasty, namely the Peisistratidai

(Herodotos: 5.65.3; Pausanias: 2.18.8–9), the Alkmaionidai (Pausanias: 2.18.8–9) and, specifically from Kodros, Solon (Plutarch, *Solon*: 1.1). The case of the first is more supportable than that of the second, since theirs is implicitly denied by Herodotos (5.62.2, 6.125.1; Rhodes, *Commentary*: 186–7). On Solon see Jacoby (*Notes*: 63, n. 70). More interesting for the place of some of these names in the king list is the fact that Medon is now known to be the eponym of a phratry and probably also a *genos*, the Medontidai (*IG*, I³: 1062, 1383, *IG* II²: 1233; *Agora Inventory* no. I. 5509; Jacoby, *Notes*: 63–4, n. 70; Lambert 1993:220–2, 314–18; Parker 1996:326), just as Apheidias and Thymoites probably were. The role of family, phratry and deme tradition in the creation of the mythical portion of the *Atthis* is beyond question, even though we cannot often quantify it. No cult is recorded for Melanthos or Medon, but the situation is different for Kodros. An inscription from the time of Augustus purports to record his burial site at the foot of the Acropolis (*IG*, II²: 4258), but, more importantly, a fifth-century document (*IG*, I³: 84) associates him with the cult of the obscure divinities, Neleus and Basile, at the Neleion (see Kearns 1989:178). His greater importance may be reflected in the generally more favourable tradition about him especially the notion that he sacrificed himself for the country (see Lycourgos, *Against Leokrates*: 86; Pausanias: 7.25.2).

Finally, it goes without saying that the etymology of the common Ionian festival of the *Apatouria*, offered by Hellanikos, is wide of the mark. One hopes it did not originate with him, but it is impossible to be certain, since it is not untypical of the calibre of ancient etymology. That festival, that took place in the autumn in the Athenian month Pyanepsion, was an important occasion in the annual calendar of the phratries and marked an especially significant point in the lives of children and their admission into full civic life. For a traditional interpretation of it see Parke (1977:88–92) and Lambert (1993:143–89). For an entirely different view of the phratries and their major festival see Robertson (1992:32–89).

Life-rulers

Akastos

Kastor: Akastos, son of Medon, 36 years (1049/8–1013/2).

Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias* p. 336 (Mosshammer); Adler and Tuffin, p. 209: Akastos, son of Medon, was the 19th (?) of the Athenians, 2nd (lifelong) ruler; he ruled for 35 years, (beginning) 4452 anno mundi. In his time the migration of the Ionians (took place), and it is reported by some that Homer lived amongst the Greeks, though others say (he lived) a little earlier, others later.

Arkhippos

Kastor: Arkhippos, son of Akastos, 19 years (1013/2–994/3).

Thersippos

Kastor: Thersippos, son of Arkhippos, 41 years (994/3–953/2).

Phorbas

Kastor: Phorbas, son of Thersippos, 30 years (953/2–922/1).

Megakles

Kastor: Megakles, son of Phorbas, 30 years (922/1–892/1).

Diognetos

Kastor: Diognetos, son of Megakles, 28 years (892/1–864/3).

MP, epoch 29 (906/5): From the time when Homer the poet came into existence, 643 years, when [D]iognetos was king of Athens.

Pherekles

Kastor: Pherekles, son of Diognetos, 19 years (864/3–845/4).

MP, epoch 30 (894/3): From the time when Ph[ei]don the Argive made public [his measures] and established the weights and made silver coinage in Argos, he being eleventh (in descent) from Herakles, 631 years, when [Pherekl]es was king of Athens.

Ariphron

Kastor: Ariphron, son of Pherekles, 20 years (845/4–825/4).

Thespheus

Kastor: Thespheus, son of Ariphron, <27 years> (825/4–798/7).

Agamestor

Kastor: Agamestor, son of Thespieus, 19 years (798/7–778/7).

Aiskhylos

Kastor: Aiskhylos (Kastor has Aiskhyles), son of Agamestor, 23 years (778/7–756/5). Under him, in the twelfth (second) year, the first Olympiad was celebrated, in which Koroibos the Elian was victorious in the stadion. The total number of years for the Athenians up to the First Olympiad from the time of Kekrops, who was called Diphyes, amounts to 780 (i.e. 1556/5–777/6), and from Ogygos, 970. From this time on it is appropriate to reckon time by Olympiads.

MP, epoch 31 (?): From the time when Arkhias, son of Evagetos, who was tenth from Temenos, led a colony out from Korinth [and founded] Syraku[se], 500+ years, when Aiskhylos was in his 21st year as *king* of Athens.

Alkmaion

Kastor: Alkmaion. After Aiskhylos Alkmaion ruled over the Athenians for 2 years (755/4–754/3). After this man it was decided that the rule would be for 10 years.

Ten-year-rulers

Kharops (753/2–743/2).

Aisimedes (743/2–733/2).

Kleidikos (733/2–723/2).

Hippomenes (723/2–713/12).

Leokrates (713/12–703/2).

Apsandros (703/2–693/2).

Erexios (693/2–684/3). Under this man it was decided to elect annual magistrates. And the first to rule as annual magistrate was **Kreon, in the 24th Olympiad (684/3–681/0).**

MP, epoch 32: From the time when the archon held office annually, 420 years (683/2).

92. Philokhoros F211 = Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias* p. 340 (Mosshammer); Adler and Tuffin, p. 212: Some say that Homer, the great poet among the Greeks, was at the height of his career before the return of the Herakleidai, but Eratosthenes and his followers (date his prime) 100 years after the Trojan War, while Aristarkhos' group (say it was) 100 years after that during the time of the Ionian migration **and Philokhoros also (places him) during the Ionian migration, at the time of Arkhippos, one of the lifetime rulers at Athens, 180 years after the Trojan War.** But Apollodoros the Athenian and his followers (date Homer) 250 years later than the Iliadic Wars, others (place him) a little before the Olympiads, 400 years after the capture of Ilion, and yet others (say he lived) in the time of Arkhilokhos, around the twenty-third Olympiad, some 500 years after the capture of Troy. To put it in a nutshell there is total disagreement amongst the ancients concerning his date.

Commentary

This impressive list of so-called life-archons and ten-year-archons, with its incredible succession of fathers and sons (usually called the Kodridai), was obviously contrived to bridge the gap between the known figures of the mythical past and the first name on the archon list, Kreon. We may reasonably assume that its creator (to a large extent, anyway) was Hellanikos, since he was undoubtedly the first to make use of the archon list as a chronological frame and would, therefore, have been the first to be faced with the need to find names to fill the empty space between his mythological calculations and his historical data. It is not surprising, therefore, that little or nothing is recorded about any of these individuals, between Akastos and Hippomenes, with the notable exception that a chronological connection was made between Aiskhylos and the first Olympiad (obviously by some later chronographer in the fourth century or after). But Hellanikos, who was not of course from Athens, cannot have created this list without some assistance. No doubt, if we knew more about the smaller societal units in Attika, like the phratries and *gene*, we would be able to explain more of the names on the list, but the proven existence of phratries such as the Apheidantidai, Thymaitis and Medontidai (see above), and the presence on the list of such names as Megakles and Alkmaion (to mention just two) suggest that Hellanikos had help from these units, at least.

But, if the list of names down to Kreon was largely the work of Hellanikos, it is quite unlikely that he was also responsible for the concept of archons (rulers) for life, or for ten years. As can be seen from comparing the entries in *MP* with those in Kastor or Georgios Synkellos, the chronographic tradition had inherited two views regarding these names, one of which (*MP*) believed they were all kings. This view can also be seen in Pausanias (1.3.3), who can claim to know the names of Athenian kings down to Kleidikos, son of Aisimedes, the predecessor of Hippomenes. This Hippomenes is one of the only names to have a narrative attached to it. According to Herakleides Lembos' epitome of Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia* (*On Constitutions*, F1) he caught his daughter, Limone, in bed with her lover. He killed the man on the spot and shut Limone in a room with a horse until she died. This was connected to the proverbial saying 'By horse and girl' (*Souda* s.v. *Parippon kai koren*). The explanation for this harsh behaviour that Herakleides offers, namely that Hippomenes

was trying to counter the reputation of the Kodridai for softness and regain the kingship by demonstrating toughness, is less credible than the alternative, that the monarchy was ended as a result of his cruelty. A reasonable inference is that Hippomenes was the last king in one list, and that list is usually considered to be the one produced by Hellanikos.

On the other hand #92 shows that Philokhoros subscribed to the alternative opinion, since he considered Arkhippos, son of Akastos, to be a life-archon. When this change was introduced into the *Atthis* and by whom is uncertain. Jacoby's hypothesis (*Text*: 43–51; *Notes*: 49–65) that it was the work of Kleidemos is based on his political interpretation of the genre and suspect for that reason, but there is no doubt that this altered view was known to the author of chapter 3.3 of the *Athenaion Politeia*, where the only point in dispute is whether Medon or Akastos was the first life-archon. This means that it was in existence by about 330 and, therefore, that if it is to be attributed to an Atthidographer (for reservations see *Androton*: 5–6), only Kleidemos and Androton are in consideration. For the clearest analysis of this issue see Rhodes (*Commentary*: 77–9, 100–1).

5

KREON TO XANTHIPPOS 683/2–
479/8

Kreon – first annual archon

MP, epoch 32 (683/2): From the time when the archon held office annually, 420 years.

Georgios Synkellos, *Ekloge Chronographias* p. 251 (Mosshammer); Adler and Tuffin, p. 309: Taken altogether (there were) 37 kings, who had ruled over Athens for 856 years from anno mundi 3945, when their rule came to an end. After them they found annual archons from amongst the *eupatridai* and a rule of nine archons was established at Athens. The rule of the annual archons began in anno mundi 4804, when Kreon took charge as first archon in the nineteenth Olympiad, though some say (it was) the 25th (Olympiad).

Commentary

From the year 683/2 onward the Atthidographers were able to build their chronicle upon an annual framework of eponymous archons. There is no question but that Hellanikos was the first to recognize the value of this newly published document (on which see Fornara, no. 23; *GHI*, no. 9) and to employ it in his *Atthis* (pace Pritchett 1996:42–8; see Möller 2001:241–62). Not only the remarks of Thucydides (1.97.2, 5.20.2–3) about Hellanikos' method show that he used the annual magistracy for chronological calculations, but one extant fragment (F26) actually preserves an archon date. Subsequent authors in the genre cannot have failed to follow suit, even though we can only document its use by two others, Androtion and Philokhoros. Subsequently, the list of Athenian archons became one of the most widely used elements in the chronological systems of the chronographers. All references to early archons have been collected and analysed by Cadoux in a fundamental article in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1948:70–123). This information has been updated by R. Develin in *Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C.* (1989).

The use of the archon list shows beyond question the documentary mentality of the Atthidographers. But the list only provided them with names. There were no historical notes attached. The challenge for the historian was to find historical data and assign them to the appropriate names. Of course, they were assisted by a variety of oral traditions (public, polis and family, on which see Thomas 1989:95ff.), but there was documentary evidence available to them as well. I have pointed out a few sources of such information in another work (*Androtion*: 40–7); the law codes of both Drakon and Solon were preserved for consultation (probably in more than one copy, see Stroud 1979), as were, no doubt, records kept in the establishments of the annual magistrates. For example, someone kept a record of the motion of a man called Ariston that dated it to the archonship of Komeas in 560/59 (Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 14.1) and the *thesmothetai* will have kept valuable records of lawsuits. I have no doubt that much of the material about the Kylonian conspiracy that we find in later accounts (Herodotos: 5.71; Thucydides: 1.126.3–12; Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 1.1 and F2 in the epitome of Herakleides Lembos, *On Constitutions*; Plutarch, *Solon*: 12.1–9), not least the opposing versions of how the rope was broken, was extracted from their records of the prosecution of the Alkmaionidai in front of a jury of aristocrats headed

by Myron of Phlya. Unfortunately, we have no preserved fragment from the Atthidographers about this notorious event, which took place in an Olympic year either in 636 or 632 and was the first recorded incident in this period, but it is hard to believe that it escaped their notice. We do, however, have more than 20 fragments from this period, relating to Solon, the Peisistratid tyranny and Kleisthenes, and it is probably acceptable to supplement them with the account of these years contained in Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*, chapters 5–22, since Aristotle either based his account upon an *Atthis* or worked with similar information. As indicated in the Introduction, for reasons of space commentary on this more familiar material will be quite brief, especially on fragments on which I have commented already elsewhere.

Drakon

624/3–621/0

Tatian, *Against the Hellenes* 41: Drakon flourished in the time of the thirty-ninth Olympiad (624/3–621/0).

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1.80.1: Drakon, the lawgiver, flourished in the time of the thirty-ninth Olympiad.

Olympiad 39.4 (621/0), Eusebios (*Armenian version*) or Olympiad 39.1 Eusebios (*Hieronymos*): Draco the legislator, in some people's opinion, flourished.

***Souda* s.v. Drakon:** He flourished about the same time as the Seven Sages, or rather he was even older. At any rate he was an old man when he made his laws for the Athenians in the thirty-ninth Olympiad.

Commentary

For Drakon see Aristotle, *Athēnaion Politeia* chapters 4 and 7.1, with Rhodes' *Commentary*; Plutarch, *Solon*: 17.1; Andokides: 1.83; Demosthenes: 23.22–86, 43.57, 47.53–73 and, especially, *IG*, I³: 104, with Stroud (1968), Gagarin (1981) and Carawan (1998). The negative reputation that surrounds Drakon was inspired largely by a fifth-century witticism reported by Aristotle in *Rhetorika*: 2.23 1400 b19, and was reinforced then, as now, by the coincidence that Solon's revision followed so soon after Drakon's work in 621. It was totally at odds with the view of him in the orators, for whom he was (with Solon) the oldest and best of lawgivers. There is no need to subscribe to his 'drakonian' image. It just so happened that the short interval between the two lawgivers witnessed a fundamental shift in the socio-economic structure of the ancient world. Coinage had been invented in Lydia by the end of the seventh century and was soon being used in Greece by the Aiginetans. No doubt the spread of its usage, in place of payments and penalties in kind (such as we find for Drakon in Pollux, *Onomastion*: 9.61) was one of the main reasons why Solon needed to revise Drakon's lawcode.

Solon – archon and *diallaktes*

Olympiad 46.2 (594/3), Hieronymos (Eusebios): Solon set up his laws, since the laws of Drakon had fallen out of date, with the exception of those that pertained to homicide.

Commentary

Solon, the great Athenian mediator (*diallaktes*) and lawgiver, was a radical in sheep's clothing. He claimed to be a moderate, but his *seisakhtheia* transformed the nature of Athenian society by creating a free and independent peasantry who owned the land they worked on. In addition he re-wrote the lawcode (only preserving Drakon's laws on homicide) and re-aligned the Athenian economy. The main sources for Solon are Plutarch's *Solon* and Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*, chapters 5–13, with Rhodes' *Commentary*. He also plays an important, though controversial, role in Herodotos (1.29–32).

The *seisakhtheia*

93. Androtion F34 = Plutarch, *Solon* 15.2: But, indeed, more recent writers do say this about the Athenians that they wittily give endearing names to unattractive matters by veiling them in decent and kindly terminology... As it appears, this device belonged to Solon first, when he named the cutting off of debts a 'shaking off of burdens' (*seisakhtheia*). For this was the first act of state he performed, after he introduced the motion that outstanding debts be remitted and that for the future no one loan money on the security of people's bodies. **And yet there are some who have written, of whom one is Androtion, that the poor were well pleased being relieved not by a cutting off of the debts but by a moderateness of interest-rates, and that they gave the name *seisakhtheia* to this kindness and to the increase of measures and the value of the currency that occurred at the same time. For he made the mina of one hundred drachmas, whereas it had previously weighed seventy, so that since they paid the same in number but less in value, the debtors received great help, while the creditors were in no way harmed.** Most writers, however, agree that the *seisakhtheia* was a removal of contracted obligations and the poems are more in harmony with this view.

94. Philokhoros F114 = *Souda*, s.v. *seisakhtheia*: A cutting off of public and private debts, which was introduced by Solon. And it is said that, to the extent that it was a custom at Athens for those of the poor who were in physical bondage to work for their creditors, it was as if, by paying, they shook off the burden. **But in Philokhoros' opinion, 'the burden was voted off'.**

Commentary

I have written extensively on these fragments elsewhere (see, especially, *Androtion*: 129–33), so will be brief here. First, on the historical issue, it is clear that Androtion's novel interpretation, if it is correctly reported by Plutarch, was rather ahead of its time even for the fourth century and was certainly anachronistic for the early sixth. It is also economically unsound. The historiographic question then arises, why Androtion devised such a theory. Was he, as Jacoby believed (*Text*: 144–6), trying to re-interpret Solon's most radical reform in a more moderate fashion so as to make it more acceptable to the politically conservative citizens of his own time, who were supposedly afraid of contemporary demands for a cancellation of debts and a redistribution of the land? In other words, was he doctoring the constitutional history of Athens to serve his own political bias? The view that he was became one of the most important foundations for Jacoby's theory of the 'political conception of the *Atthis*'. But the absence of any evidence for such revolutionary socio-economic demands in fourth-century Athens removes the hypothetical basis for this theory (Harding 1974:282–9; *Androtion*: 133).

Finally, these fragments are important elements in the discussion of the relationship (or not) of Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia* to Androtion's *Atthis*. For a review of that discussion see *Androtion*: 131–3.

The *nomothesia*

95. Androtion F36 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Birds* 1541

(‘Sovereignty is the one who stockpiles Zeus’ thunderbolt and everything else at once, excellence in counsel, orderliness, moderation, the shipyards, invective, the kolakretes, the triobols’). The kolakretes: The steward of political money. Aristophanes the grammarian says that these (officials) were stewards of pay for jury duty. But they did not only have the supervision of this, as he says, but also the expenditures on the gods were paid out through these (officials), **as Androtion writes as follows: the kolakretai are to give money for travel expenses from the naukraric fund to those who go on sacred embassy to Delphi, and they are to make expenditure on any other matter that is necessary.** And they were treasurers and men in charge of public maintenance (in the Prytaneion).

96. Philokhoros F21 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. lithos:

Demosthenes (mentions this) in the (speech) *Against Konon* (54.26), saying ‘simply leading each of my witnesses to the stone (lithos) and putting them on oath’. It seems that the Athenians made their oaths before a stone, as Aristotle indicates in the *Athenaion Politeia* (7.1, 55.5) **and Philokhoros in the third (book).**

Commentary

For the state of our knowledge (or lack of it) of the *kolakretai* and the naukraric fund see *Androtion*: 134–8, where other relevant bibliography will be found (to which add now the review of the evidence by Wallinga 2000:131–46). Some of the laws of Solon's *nomothesia* will be found in Plutarch's life, but the best collection of all the evidence is in Ruschenbusch (1966). For the history of the *axones* and *kyrbeis* see Stroud (1979).

Other sources mention the stone (*lithos*) before which the Athenians (particularly the archons) took their oaths; along with Harpokration and Aristotle see Plutarch, *Solon*: 25.3 and Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 8.86. See also Rhodes, *Commentary*, *ad loc.*

Peisistratos

(561/0–528/7)

MP, epoch 40 (561/0): From the time when Peisistratos became tyrant of Athens, 297 years, when the archon at [Athen]s was K[o]m[e]as.

97. Kleidemos F15 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 13.89, p. 609CD: And he (sc. Phylarkhos) says that the woman who led Peisistratos back to the tyranny, having the form of Athena, was beautiful, since she was like the goddess in shape. She was a seller of garlands and Peisistratos gave her into the union of marriage with his son, Hipparkhos, as Kleidemos (?) records in the eighth (book) of *Homecomings (Nostoi)*. **And he married his son, Hipparkhos, to Phye, the daughter of Sokrates, the woman who rode beside him (i.e. Peisistratos) in his chariot. And he took <Myrrhine>, the daughter of the polemarch, Kharmos, who was a very beautiful girl, for Hippias, who held the tyranny after him. And it happened, as he says, that Kharmos had been the lover (*erastes*) of Hippias and had been the first to set up the Eros by the Akademy, on which is inscribed,**

‘Eros of various devices, to you this altar was established by Kharmos in the shady edges of the gymnasion.’

98. Androtion F35 = Scholion (RV) to Aristophanes, *Akharnians* 234 (‘But it is necessary to seek the man out and look towards Ballene’): The Palleneans form a village in Attika, where a war took place between Peisistratos, who wanted to become tyrant, and the Athenians, who were resisting him... **Mention is made of this by both Androtion and Aristotle in the *Athension Politeia* (15.3).**

Commentary

#97: It is not certain that Kleidemos is the author of this passage, since he did not write a work called *Homecomings*, and some editors of Athenaios alter the name to Antikleides. Jacoby is not in doubt, however, and assigns the information to the second book of Kleidemos' *Atthis*. Maybe the aberrant title is an indication that the account has been garbled in some fashion.

Herodotos (1.60) is the best known source for the story about Phye, an extra-large girl from Paionia, who was dressed up as Athena to accompany Peisistratos in his return to Athens (on this incident see now Blok 2000:17–48 and Lavelle 2005:99–107). His was the version accepted by Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 14.4), even though he (i.e. Aristotle) knew of another that scurrilously called her a Thracian flower-girl from Kollytos. This fragment shows two things: (a) Kleidemos also recounted this story, even suggestively using the same rare word for 'riding beside' (*paraibateo*) as Aristotle; but (b) he was not Aristotle's source for the alternative version, since he claimed to know that Phye's father's name was Sokrates, which shows that he, at least, thought (or wanted people to think) that she was a citizen. Whether this was, in fact, the case is in dispute. Jacoby (*Text*: 71) is confident that it was; Davies (*APF*, no. 11793, IX) is not. Kleidemos also claimed to know details about the marriages of (a) Hipparkhos to Phye and (b) Hippias to a daughter of Kharmos (her name, Myrrhine, is supplied from Thucydides 6.55.1, where her father is Kallias not Kharmos). The information he gives about these marriages is enthusiastically accepted by Jacoby, but dismissed by Davies on what seem to me good grounds (*APF*, no. 11793, VII and IX). He accuses Kleidemos of fabrication and 'indulging in a piece of posthumous match-making'.

Also controversial is the statement about the altar of Eros at the Akademy. Pausanias (1.30.1) appears to agree with what is said here, but Plutarch (*Solon*: 1.7) asserts that the dedication was made by Peisistratos himself. In this case, even Jacoby suspects that Kleidemos is wrong.

#98: Pallene was a deme of Antiokhis, situated on the road from Marathon to Athens. The sanctuary of Athena Pallenis there was the site of Peisistratos' final battle against his opponents in 547/6 (Herodotos: 1.62; Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 15.3). For the date of the battle and a review of the competing solutions to the problem of

the chronology of Peisistratos' tyranny see Rhodes, *Commentary*: 191–9. For a recent attempt to reconstruct the battle in the context of Peisistratos' career see Lavelle 2005:134–54.

Hipparkhos

(528/7–514/3)

99a. Philokhoros F22a = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Trikephalos ('Three-headed'): Isaïos in the (speech) *Against Eukleides* (says) 'a little above the Trikephalos along Hestia street'. The full (form) is 'the Trikephalos Hermes'. **Philokhoros says in (book) three that Eukleides dedicated this at Ankyle.**

99b. Philokhoros F22b = *Souda* s.v. Trikephalos: The Hermes, as it were showing the roads and bearing an inscription, (saying) where this road leads and where that. Perhaps it used to have a head facing each road. **And the man who dedicated the Trikephalos Hermes, as Philokhoros says, was Prokleides, a lover (*erastes*) of Hipparkhos.**

100. Philokhoros F31 = Hesychios s.v. Agoraios Hermes ('Marketplace Hermes'): It was referred to in this way. **(The statue) was set up in the archonship of Kebris, as Philokhoros attests in (the) third (book).**

101. Philokhoros F23 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 14.42, p. 637F–638A: **Philokhoros in the third (book) of *Atthis* says, 'Lysandros of Sikyon was the first player on the *kithara* to make innovations in the method of playing the instrument alone without song, by tuning his strings high and making the sound fulsome, (giving) the flutelike sound to lyre-playing that Epigonos and his followers were the first to use. Stripping away the concise style then in use amongst solo kitharists, he was the first to play his *kithara* with colourful variations and iambs and *magadis*, the so-called syrigmus, and, unlike any before him, changed his instrument; indeed, after improving the craft, he was the first to set a group (of dancers or singers) around (him).'**

Commentary

If the restoration in *Marmor Parium*, ep. 45 (see under ‘Expulsion of the Peisistratidai’) is correct, that work treated Hipparkhos as the successor to Peisistratos and, consequently, believed he was older than Hippias. This incorrect view, which is also found in [Plato]

Hipparkhos: 228b, was castigated by Thucydides (6.54.2). It is now regularly blamed upon Hellanikos (see e.g. Davies, *APF*, no. 11793, IV; Rhodes, *Commentary*: 227–8), following Jacoby’s speculation in *Atthis* (158–61). There is no question that the popular opinion was that Hipparkhos was the older, as the Harmodios scholion shows, but maybe that was enough for Thucydides to rail against. We have no direct proof for what Hellanikos said on this issue.

The tradition concerning Hipparkhos’ character, preserved in *Athenaion Politeia*: 18.1, is that he was *erotikos* (‘of an amorous nature’) and *philomousos* (‘fond of the arts’). The first characteristic is enshrined in the notorious prelude to the story of his assassination by Harmodios and Aristogeiton, one of the most famous incidents in Athenian history (cf. Herodotos: 5.55–6; Thucydides: 1.20, 6.53–9; Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 18; and the Harmodios scholion in *Athenaios*, *Deipnosophistai*: 15.50 p. 695AB). It may also be reflected in #99b, where Prokleides is called an *erastes* of Hipparkhos, though that term should mean that Hipparkhos was the object of affection. Nothing else is known of Prokleides (or Eukleides).

More important is the reference to the setting up of Herms at road-crossings, maybe radiating from the market-place (#100) as markers for distances. That these Herms were especially associated with Hipparkhos, even to the point of having verse inscriptions engraved upon them, is attested in [Plato], *Hipparkhos*: 228b–229b. A good extant example is *IG*, I²: 837. See on these Lavelle (1985:411–20) and Slings (2000:57–60). It is a pity that we are unable to date the archonship of Kebriis. Cadoux (1948:119) leaves him floating anywhere between 587/6 and 482/1. Develin (*AO*: 44) hesitantly places him at 551/0, but that seems too early.

The other side to his character, his fondness for the arts (especially literature) is also confirmed by [Plato], *Hipparkhos*: 228b–229b. Both [Plato] and Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 18.1) credit him with bringing poets to Athens, amongst whom were Anakreon of Teos and Simonides of Keos. This may explain the presence of #101 here. Since it is assigned to the third book of Philokhoros’ *Atthis*, it should fit

somewhere within the early sixth and the mid-fifth century, and the most logical place for it to have any relevance to Athenian history seems likely to be a discussion of Hipparkhos' literary activities. Unfortunately, we know nothing of this Lysandros. For a recent evaluation of Peisistratid (especially Hipparkhan) patronage of literature see Slings (2000:57–77).

Owls and bulls: the history of Athenian coinage

102. Philokhoros (F200) = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Birds* 1106 ('You will never be short of owls from Laureion'): **The owl was on the stamp of the tetradrakhm, as Philokhoros (says). [At that time] the currency, the tetradrakhm, was called the owl. For at that time the device imprinted (on the coin) was an owl and a face of Athena, while the previous coins, that were didrachms, had an ox as their device.**

Commentary

The reference must be to the change from the so-called *wappenmünzen* ('heraldic coins') of the sixth century, which were almost exclusively didrachms and bore many devices including the ox, to the standard Athenian tetradrachms of the fifth century and later, that carried the head of Athena on the obverse side and the owl and olive branch on the reverse. The numismatic arguments for dating the first to the time of Peisistratos and the latter to the last part of the sixth century, either during the dominance of Hippias and Hipparkhos or following their expulsion, have been marshalled most effectively by Kraay (1956:43–68 and 1976, [chapter 4](#)). On the relevance of this dating to the view that Solon reformed Athenian coinage, as described in Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 10, see Kraay 1968:1–9; Rhodes, *Commentary*, *ad loc.*

Associated with the change in design and denomination was the shift from the use of imported silver to exploitation of the superior silver deposits in the region of Laureion in southern Attika (van der Vin 2000:147–53). How the Athenian state administered this resource in the fourth century is indicated by Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 47.2, with Rhodes, *Commentary*, *ad loc.*), but the best evidence comes from archaeology and the inscriptional records (archaeology: Hopper 1953:200–54, 1968:293–326; inscriptions: Crosby 1950:189–312; 1957:1–23). An interesting lawsuit involving these regulations is Demosthenes: 37 (*Against Pantainetos*), for which see Carey and Reid (1985). Of course, this is the region in which the rich strike was made in 483/2 that made it possible for Themistokles to persuade the Athenians to build a fleet of warships (Herodotos: 7.144.1–2; Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 22.7; Plutarch, *Themistokles*: 4.1–3; *et al.*).

The Alkmaionidai and the temple of Apollo at Delphi

(513/12?)

103. Philokhoros F115 = Scholion to Pindar, *Pythian* 7.9b ('The sons of Alkmaion...who built your house, Apollo, at holy Pytho, to be an object of wonder.'): Some people (say) that they made the temple of Apollo more famous through the hymn and the victory. Others (interpret the reference) in accordance with history. For, it is said that the Alkmaionidai, who had been exiled by the Peisistratidai, undertook to rebuild the Pythian temple that had been burned down, as some say by the Peisistratidai. With the money they received, they gathered a force and attacked the Peisistratidai, and after gaining the upper hand in battle, **they rebuilt the sanctuary for the god with greater expressions of gratitude, as Philokhoros records, since they had made this vow to the god beforehand.**

Commentary

The involvement of the Alkmaionidai in the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, that burned down in 548/7 (the archonship of Erxikleides; Pausanias: 10.5.13), is well attested (see Pindar, *Pythian*: 7; Herodotos: 5.62.2–3, 5.63.1; Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 19.3–4 with Rhodes, *Commentary*; Isokrates, *Antidosis*: 232; Demosthenes: 21.144 with scholia [Dilts]; and MacDowell 1990: *ad loc.*). It is part of a much larger story about the part that family played in the expulsion of the Peisistratidai, which itself is one element in a nexus of competing traditions (i.e. the sacrifice of the tyrannicides; the assistance of Sparta under king Kleomenes) that surrounded that event in Athenian memory and historiography. The complicated relationship of these traditions and the way they evolved over time in response to changing circumstances (e.g. the tyranny of the Thirty and the restoration of the democracy at the end of the fifth century) has now been subjected to a penetrating analysis by Thomas (1989:238–82), which renders all previous discussions obsolete.

As Jacoby correctly maintained (*Text*: 454), and others agree, the history is fairly clear: Delphi, the exiled Athenian aristocrats (especially the Alkmaionidai after their failed attack on Leipsydriion in 514/13), and the Spartans all collaborated to some extent in the expulsion of Hippias in 511/10. It is the historiography that is in question, because of differences in the tradition that existed between the first account (Herodotos') and the versions that became current in the fifth and fourth centuries and are extant in the works of Isokrates, Demosthenes and Aristotle. These differences involve details such as when the Alkmaionidai fulfilled their contract (i.e. before or after the expulsion), whether they used their own money or received funds from the sanctuary and whether they bribed the Pythia to influence the Spartans or not.

Here, the focus of discussion must be on the Atthidographers, or rather Philokhoros, since this fragment from Philokhoros is the only certain indication that we have for what the Atthidographers said on this huge issue. This fact has not, of course, prevented some from indulging in imaginative speculation, attributing views to Hellanikos, Kleidemos and Androtion without the permission of the evidence. Perhaps the worst example is Forrest (1969:277–86), whose article is an object lesson in how not to treat fragmentary evidence. But, before we can approach Philokhoros' view, we have to decide how much of

the scholion on Pindar can actually be attributed to him. As Kinzl pointed out (1974:179), the only words that can safely be attributed to Philokhoros are the ones that I have printed in bold type. But, his attempt to claim Ephoros as the author of the rest of the scholion (and the similar content of the scholia to Demosthenes: 21.144) has not won acceptance (see Rhodes, *Commentary*: 237; MacDowell 1990:359). In fact, even if the words in bold are all that the scholiast took from Philokhoros, those words imply agreement with an essential element of the rest of the scholion (i.e. that the building of the temple was subsequent to a undertaking that had been made). It is hard, therefore, to divorce the final section of the scholion from, at least, the spirit, if not the actual wording of the rest, and this is the assumption that underlies Jacoby's discussion (*Text*: 449–54).

That being the case, Philokhoros' account would appear to have been a somewhat rationalized version of Aristotle's, whose own narrative was a modified form of Herodotos' (Thomas 1989:255–6). Whether those modifications (e.g. the absence of reference to bribery of the Pythia and difference in the chronology) were the result of purposeful alteration of the oral tradition for political reasons, or changes to the literary record based upon research (after all, Herodotos was not infallible) is a matter for personal resolution. But, in making that decision, I feel a distinction should be made between the historiographic tradition (i.e. Herodotos-Aristotle-Philokhoros) and the rhetorical, as represented by Isokrates and Demosthenes. Rhetoric danced to its own tune and there is no evidence that the orators consulted history books (*pace* Forrest 1969:277) for their references to past events (see Harding 1987a: 25–39).

The great freeze

(between 522/1 and 512/11 or 496/5)

104. Philokhoros F202 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Akharnians* 220 ('And old Lakrateides' leg is slow with age'): **'Old Lakrateides'** (was) an archon at Athens, as Philokhoros tells. He held office in the time of Dareios. In his time a very great snowfall occurred and everything froze over, so that it was not possible for anyone to go out. That is the reason why all cold periods used to be called 'of Lakrateides'.

Commentary

This fragment is interesting for two reasons. First, it demonstrates that the range of information contained in the *Atthis* included references to natural and weather-related phenomena (cf. Melanthios F1 = #285 in [Appendix 1](#)). Second, it reveals one of the ways such information was preserved. Since we can be fairly certain that there were no notes attached to the names on the archon list and given that there was no such thing as a meteorological service to keep records of this kind, the point of departure for the Atthidographers' research must have been the proverbial saying 'of Lakrateides' and its association in popular memory with an extreme weather-event. Philokhoros (or one of his predecessors) may then have acquired the additional information regarding the approximate date ('in the time of Dareios') from members of the family, if perchance Lakrateides was from the famous Eumolpid clan from Eleusis, which was still active in the fourth century (cf. #200 in [Chapter 7](#)). We are unable to fix the date of Lakrateides' archonship more precisely; Cadoux (1948:119) assigns him any of the unoccupied years on his list between 521/0 and 497/6, while Develin (*AO*: 48) raises the lower terminus to 512/11.

Expulsion of the Peisistratidai

***MP*, epoch 45 (511/0):** From the time when Harmodios and [Aristoge]iton killed [Hippa]rkhos the *successor* to Peisistratos and the Athenians *expelled* the Peisistratidai from the [P]elargic wall, 248 years, when the archon at Athens was Ha[r]p[aktides].

Commentary

It is disappointing and somewhat surprising that we do not have any extant fragments from the Atthidographers directly related to the expulsion of the Peisistratidai, since it was such a formative element in Athenian history. But they undoubtedly recorded the event. For speculation regarding what they did say see the note on ‘The Alkmaionidai and the Temple of Apollo at Delphi’ above. The only information that can be extracted from the entry in the *Marmor Parium* is confirmation of the name of the archon in whose year Hippias was expelled (cf. Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 19.6; Cadoux 1948:112–13; *AO*: 48) and the possible indication that the Atthidographic source it was following considered Hipparkhos the ‘successor’ to Peisistratos, though not everyone accepts that restoration (see Slings 2000:59 n.5).

The reforms of Kleisthenes

105. Hellanikos F6 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F43) = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Alope: Lykourgos (mentions her) in the (speech) *On the priestess*. **She was a daughter of Kerkyon, from whose union with Poseidon (was born) Hippothoon, the eponym of the tribe Hippothontis, as Hellanikos (says) in (the) second (book) of *Atthis*, and as Euripides (says) in the drama of the same name (i.e. Hippothoon) and Deinarkhos in the property dispute of the Phalerians.**

106. Kleidemos F7 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Pykni: Hypereides in the (speech) *On behalf of Khairephilos* 1, says ‘and so much of the Pnyx...’. The Assembly of the Athenians was so called. There is much mention of it by the Attic writers. **And Kleidemos in (book) three of *Protogonia* (says), ‘they used to congregate at the Pnyx, which got its name from the fact that their assembly was closely-packed (*pyknoumenen*)’.**

107. Kleidemos F8 = Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Naukraria: Previously, they used to be called the naukraria and naukraros; now the naukraria is something like the symmory or deme, and the naukraros is sort of a demarch, according to the names given them by Solon, as Aristotle says (*Athenaion Politeia*: 8.3, 21.5). And in the *Laws* (there is), ‘If anyone disputes the naukrary’ and ‘the naukraroi in charge of the naukrary’. But later, after Kleisthenes, they are demes, and they (i.e. the naukraroi) were called demarchs. From Aristotle’s *Politeia* (8.3), regarding the way Solon organised the city, ‘there were four tribes, just as before, and four tribe-kings. From each of the tribes there were apportioned three *trittyes*, and twelve naukraries for each’. **Kleidemos in the third (book) says that when Kleisthenes made ten tribes in place of the four, it turned out that they were arranged into fifty parts, which were called naukraries, just as now they use the name *symmories* for those divided into the one hundred parts.**

108. Androtion F5 = Harpokration, *Lexikon*, s.v. Apodektai (Receivers): A magistracy amongst the Athenians is the Apodektai. The orators and the comic (playwrights) often make mention of it. And Aristotle in the *Athenaion Politeia* has shown that they were ten (48.1–2) and that they took over the written accounts and erased the sums that were paid in the presence of the *boule* in the Bouleuterion, and in turn gave back the records to the public slave. And he simply makes clear what they do. **But that the Apodektai were appointed by Kleisthenes in place of the Kolakretai (is told by) Androtion (in**

book) two.

109. Androtion F6 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Hipparkhos: Demosthenes (speaks of him) in the (speech) *On behalf of Ktesiphon* (18.295). This man was a tyrant of Eretria. And there is another Hipparkhos, about whom Lykourgos speaks in the (speech) *Against Lykophron*, (namely) Hipparkhos, son of Peisistratos. **And another is Hipparkhos, the son of Kharmos, as Lykourgos says in the *Against Leokrates* (117–18). Concerning this man Androtion in (book) two says that he was a relative of Peisistratos, the tyrant, and (that he) was the first to be ostracized, since the law regarding ostracism had then for the first time been established on account of the suspicion of the supporters of Peisistratos, because while being a demagogue and general (strategos) he had ruled as a tyrant.**

110. Philokhoros F24 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Alopeke: A deme of the tribe Antiokhis. **In (book) three Philokhoros reveals whence it derived its name.**

111. Philokhoros F25 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Kerameis: Diodoros (the periegetes) says that Kerameis is a deme of the tribe Akamantis. **Philokhoros in (book) three says that these took their name from the pottery craft and from the fact that they sacrifice to a hero Keramos.**

112. Philokhoros F26 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Kolonetai: Hypereides (mentions this) in the (speech) *Against Apellaion over the treasure*. Those who hired themselves out for labour were called *kolonetai*, since they stood around by the Kolonos, which is near the agora, where the Hephaisteion and Eurysakeion are. This Kolonos was called ‘of the marketplace’ (*agoraios*). There was also another Kolonos, near the sanctuary of Poseidon, as Hypereides (says) in the (speech) *Against Autikles*. This one would be the Kolonos of the horses. Pherekrates in *Leaf*: ‘Hey you, where have you come from?’ ‘I was hurrying to Kolonos, not the marketplace one, but the one of the horsemen’. **Concerning the Kolonos there is a description by both Diodoros the periegetes and by Philokhoros in (book) three of *Atthis*.**

113. Philokhoros F27 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Melite: Melite is a deme of the (tribe) Kekropis. **In (book) three Philokhoros says the deme got its name from Melite, the daughter of Myrmex (according to Hesiod) or of Dios, son of Apollo (according to Musaio).**

114. Philokhoros F28 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Oiethen: Oie (was) a deme of the (tribe) Pandionis, as Diodoros (the periegetes) says. **Philokhoros records in (book) three that Oie was the daughter of Kephalos and wife of Kharops.**

115. Philokhoros F29 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Oion: There is a pair of demes in Attika that they call Oion, both in the neuter gender. **Philokhoros in the third (book)** says that it got this name from the fact that it was in no way a habitable place, but was deserted. For the ancients used to call ‘deserted’ (*monos*) ‘alone’ (*oios*).

116. Philokhoros F30 = *Lexikon rhetoricum Cantabrigense* p. 354.1N; *Lexikon* to Demosthenes *Against Aristokrates* (P. Berol. 5008, B27): The manner of ostracism: **Philokhoros in the third (book)** lays out the (law of) ostracism, writing as follows: ‘The (law of) ostra[cism (is) the following]: The people take an advance vote before the eighth prytany regarding whether it is good to hold a (vote for) ostracism. Whenever it was decided (to do so), the agora was fenced off with wooden boards, in which there were left ten entrances, through which they (i.e. the people) entered tribe by tribe and cast their ballots (*ostraka*), concealing the writing. The nine archons and the boule were in charge. When they had reckoned up whose votes were the most, provided they were not less than six thousand, this man had to settle his private affairs within ten days and leave the city for ten years, later the number of years was five, though he continued to enjoy the proceeds of his private property, provided he did not come within (Attic territory inside of) Geraistos, the promontory of Euboia.’ ***The only undistinguished person to be ostracized was Hyperbolos, (who was ostracized) on account of the baseness of his character, not out of suspicion (that he was aiming) at tyranny. After him the practice was discontinued, having begun (as part of) the legislation of Kleisthenes, when he dissolved the tyranny, his intention being to kick out the friends (i.e. of the tyrants) as well.

Commentary

These fragments collectively illustrate the fact that the Atthidographers, from first to last, went into detail about the reforms of Kleisthenes. They clearly had much more to say about them even than Aristotle in his *Athenaion Politeia* (20–2). From Hellanikos we get a reference to the mythical origin of the quite obscure Eleusinian hero, Hippothoon, whom Kleisthenes chose to be eponym of one of his ten new tribes (cf. Istros F10 = #80, though in his account Theseus has displaced Poseidon as the rapist of the daughters of Kerkyon). On Hippothoon see Kron (1976:177–87) and Kearns (1989:173). No doubt the other nine eponymous heroes were given similar treatment, though none of that has survived. See the works of Kron and Kearns for all the evidence we possess on the eponymi.

Several fragments of Philokhoros (#110–15) show that he also wrote extensively on the origin and background of the Kleisthenic demes. To these should probably be added some entries from [Appendix I](#), namely #228a/b (Hellanikos F5a/b), #270, 271 and 272 (Androtion F66, 67, 68) and #291, 305 and 307 (Philokhoros F62, 201, 205), which indicate that he was not the first or only author to do so. For information on the number, location and size of the demes and their representation on the Council of 500 see Traill (1975). His clear demonstration that demes were represented on the Council in proportion to their population illustrates how fundamental they were to Kleisthenes' system and fully justifies the attention they received from the Atthidographers.

Other fragments show that the Atthidographers dealt with Kleisthenes' legislation as well as his reorganization of the criteria for citizenship, the franchise and public office. For example, both Androtion and Philokhoros provide information about the law on ostracism, Androtion (#109) on an aspect of its history, Philokhoros (#116) on the procedure. The citation from Androtion is somewhat notorious in the history of study of the *Atthis*. Because, on a casual reading, it appeared to suggest that the law was introduced at the time when it was first used (in 488/7), it looked as though Androtion denied that Kleisthenes had created it and this inference became a key element in Jacoby's view of Androtion's supposed political bias as 'moderately-conservative' and, consequently, of his idea of the 'political conception' of the *Atthis*. Fortunately, a better understanding

of the way Harpokration has garbled his sources has dissolved this notion and made it clear that Androtion ascribed ostracism to Kleisthenes, like Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 22 with Rhodes, *Commentary*) and other reliable sources (for a review of this issue see *Androtion*: 94–8). For further indication of the way the scholarship of Classical and Hellenistic researchers suffered at the hands of lexicographers and scholiasts through compression and abbreviation see Gibson (2002:13–20) and Harding (*Didymos*: 31–9).

As for the procedure used in the application of ostracism, Philokhoros F30 (#116) provides us with the best description extant and is consequently at the root of all discussions of this issue. Other treatments (i.e. Plutarch, *Aristeides*: 7.2–6; Diodoros: 11.55; Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 8.19–20; scholion to Aristophanes, *Knights*: 855) agree on most of the details. Only Diodoros gives five rather than ten as the number of years an ostracized person had to stay out of Attika. The real point of disagreement concerns the number of votes required to have a person ostracized. Only Plutarch states that 6000 was the number required to make an *ostrakophoria* valid and that the person with the majority of those votes was ostracized. All other sources, including Philokhoros, state that 6,000 was the number of votes needed to have a person sent into exile. Since 6,000 is the standard quorum in the Athenian democratic system (see Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 24.3 with Rhodes, *Commentary*; Hansen 1987:14–19), most believe that Plutarch is correct. This would mean that Philokhoros was in error, but see Jacoby (*Text*: 317), who does ‘not like to impute’ such a misunderstanding to Philokhoros and proposes, maybe correctly, that the lexicographer is once again at fault. For the last ostracism, of Hyperbolos, in 417/16 see Androtion F42 (#155 in [Chapter 6](#)). After that, the Athenians ceased to use the procedure, though it remained on the books and they went through the motions of voting in every sixth prytany whether or not to hold a vote (Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 43.5).

I have dealt with the difficulties in Androtion’s statement about the Apodektai in detail elsewhere (*Androtion*: 90–4). Our first inscriptional evidence for these officials occurs in a decree of 418/17 (*IG*, I³: 84), which also contains the last reference to the Kolakretai, a magistracy of Solonian or even pre-Solonian antiquity (see Androtion F36 = #95). But what exactly that might signify is not evident, since these two officials complemented ‘rather than replicated each other’ (apodektai being ‘receivers’ of revenue, kolakretai being ‘disbursers’). It is possible, but highly unlikely (given his own experience with the financial affairs of the state), that Androtion did not know the history of the Apodektai. More likely, I suggest (*Androtion*: 93), the word ‘anti’ translated as ‘in place of’ should be taken to mean ‘equal to’. In

that case, Kleisthenes could have been the creator of the magistracy, having established them as a separate board to take over one side of the duties of the Kolakretai.

Finally, there remain two citations from Kleidemos. F7 (#106) may not necessarily belong to the time of Kleisthenes, since it makes no reference to him. Nevertheless, Jacoby assigns it to 508/7. If Jacoby is correct, Kleidemos' reference to the Pnyx may have been anachronistic. Although archaeologists originally accepted 500 as the date for the first building phase on the hill (see Travlos 1971:466–76), our present understanding dates it to the 460s (Hansen 1987:12–19, 131–3). Kleidemos' etymology, on the other hand, which is what he was cited for, is not unacceptable to the editors of the Greek *Lexikon*. There is a useful collection of essays on the Pnyx edited by Forsén and Stanton (1996).

F8 (#107) is another quotation that has obviously suffered from compression. It is clear that Kleidemos was discussing not the new *phylai*, but rather the *naukrariai*, which he likened to the *symmories* of his own day. His linking of these two institutions has important repercussions for the understanding of both and possibly even for the date of publication of his *Atthis*, but all that will be better discussed at the appropriate context in the fourth century in relation to the trierarchic system of that time (see #185, 186 and 187). For the *naukrariai* see above #95 (Androton F36).

Fortification of the Peiraieus

(493/2) ?

117. Philokhoros F203 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Peace* 145 ('Of course, there is dung-beetle (*kantharos*) harbour in the Peiraieus, isn't there?'): A part of the Peiraieus, as Kallikrates or Menekles says in his book *About Athens*, in the following words: 'The Peiraieus has three harbours, all closed. One is the harbour called Beetle's (*kantharos*), in which are sixty shipsheds, next the Aphrodision, then, as one goes round the harbour, five stoas'. Alternatively: Perhaps the name prevailed somehow from the stationing there of ships of that sort. **For, in fact, Philokhoros records that there exists in Attika a village, Kantháros' Limen, not Kántharos, named thus after some local hero.**

Commentary

Kantharos is a word that denotes, first and foremost, the dung-beetle, next, a large drinking goblet, and third, a type of ship. Hence, all the references here. After one of these meanings was named the main (*Megas*) harbour of the Peiraieus, for which see Garland (1987:8–9), though his preference (‘goblet’) hardly explains the pun in the line from Aristophanes (see Platnauer 1964:79). We have no knowledge of the village Philokhoros is said to have referred to, nor of the hero Kantharos (Kearns 1989:175). Jacoby (*Text*: 571–2) assigns this fragment to Philokhoros’ treatment of Themistokles’ fortification of the Peiraieus in 493/2 and associates it with F201 (#305), but this is very speculative.

The Persian Wars

***MP*, epoch 48 (490/89):** From the time when the battle at Marathon took place for the Athenians against the Persians, Ar[taph]e[rnes] the nephew of Dareios [and Da]tis his general, the battle which the Athenians won, 227 years, when the archon at Athens was [Ph]a[i]n[i]p[pid]es the second (sc. person of that name to be archon). One of the participants in that battle was Aiskhylos the poet, when he was 35 *years* old.

***MP*, epoch 51 (480/79):** From the time when Xerxes strung together his bridge of boats in the Hellespont and dug a channel through Athos, and the battle in Thermopylai took place and the naval battle for the Hellenes against the Persians off Salamis, which the Hellenes won, 217 years, when the archon at Athens was Kalliades.

***MP*, epoch 52 (479/8):** From the time when the battle at Plataia took place for the Athenians against Mardonios the general of Xerxes, which the Athenians won, and Mardonios was killed in the battle, and fire flowed in Sicily in the vicinity of Aitna, 216 years, when the archon at Athens was Xanthippos.

Commentary

Surprisingly, no fragments remain from the year of Marathon, but it is hardly to be doubted that that great Athenian victory was recorded by the Atthidographers, though once again we have to rely on the chronographic tradition for evidence that they did (*MP*, epoch 48, with, however, the wrong spelling for the archon's name). But they may not have felt the need to provide too much detail, because Herodotos' work held the field. Even Aristotle in the *Athenaion Politeia* devotes only one sentence to Marathon (22.3). Rather, in chapter 22 he focuses upon other events from the period between Marathon and Xerxes' invasion. Some of these are attached to archon dates and these are the most likely details to derive from an *Atthis* (i.e. besides Marathon, he names the archon for the first swearing of the bouleutic oath, the introduction of the lot for selecting archons, the discovery of the mines at Maroneia and the amnesty for the ostracized). Whether the list of those people ostracized in this period that Aristotle also provides in this chapter derives from the same source is not so clear. These ostracisms are not dated by archon. See my discussion (*Androtion*: 94–5).

Xerxes' invasion

(480/79)

THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS

118. Hellanikos F28 = Plutarch, *De malignitate Herodoti* 36 = *Moralia* 869A: (Herodotos says that) ‘the Naxians sent three triremes to aid the barbarians, but one of the trierarchs, Demokritos, persuaded the rest to choose the side of the Hellenes’ (8.46.3). That is an example of the way he is incapable of praising without finding fault. In order that one man get praise, the whole city and its people have to be slandered. **But two historians witness against him, Hellanikos from the older ones, Ephoros from the more recent. In their histories, the former says that the Naxians came to aid the Greeks with six ships, the latter says with five.**

119. Kleidemos F21 = Plutarch, *Themistokles* 10.6: Since there was a lack of public money for the Athenians, Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 23.1) says that the council from the Areios Pagos, by providing eight drachmas to each of the men going on campaign, was most responsible for getting the triremes manned. **But Kleidemos makes this also one of Themistokles’ stratagems. For, he says that, as the Athenians were on their way down to the Peiraieus, the Gorgon’s head from the statue of Athena went missing, whereupon, Themistokles, pretending to look for it and examining everything, discovered a great amount of money hidden in the baggage. When this money was brought out into the open, it provided expenses for the men who were boarding the ships.**

120. Phanodemos F24 = Plutarch, *Themistokles*, 13.1: At the break of day Xerxes sat down on an elevated spot, from which he had a view of his fleet and its arrangement for battle. **According to Phanodemos (his position) was above the sanctuary of Herakles, where the island is separated from Attika by a narrow passage,** but Akestodoros (says it was) in the border territory of the Megaris, overlooking the so-called ‘Horns’. (There) he set up his golden throne, surrounding himself with a host of scribes, whose task it was to record what was done during the battle.

121. Philokhoros F116 = Aelian, *On the Nature of Animals*, 12.35: I have learned...that dogs were like slaves fawning upon Xanthippos son of Ariphros. **For when the Athenians were leaving their homes for their ships, at the time when the Persian kindled the great war against Hellas and the oracles proclaimed that it was better for the Athenians to abandon their country and board their**

triremes, not even the dogs failed (to obey) the proclamation, but they left home together with Xanthippos and by swimming over got away to Salamis. Both Aristotle and Philokhoros tell this story.

Commentary

#118: In his eagerness to accuse Herodotos of bias, Plutarch himself has erred in that direction, by misrepresenting the number of ships that Herodotos credited to the Naxians. Herodotos says four not three. On the other hand, Plutarch usefully preserves for us an epigram by Simonides about the part played by Demokritos at the battle of Salamis (see Lazenby 1993:195). It runs as follows: ‘Demokritos was the third to initiate battle, when by Salamis / the Hellenes engaged the Medes on the open sea. / He captured five ships of the enemy, and rescued / a sixth, a Dorian ship, that was being taken by barbarian force.’ This epigram is often taken to explain the difference in the number of Naxian ships cited by Hellanikos and Ephoros, i.e. they had misread the epigram and taken it to refer to the number of Naxian ships that joined the Greek cause (How and Wells 1912:2.250; Hignett 1963:14). More likely, as Jacoby suggests (*Text*: 56), it is Plutarch who has distorted what they said in order to facilitate his attack upon Herodotos.

#119: Most are willing to accept the historicity of the initiative described here, at least to the extent that some financial assistance was supplied to the crews who manned the triremes at Salamis (see Rhodes, *Commentary*: 288–9). Once more, it is the historiography that causes problems. Kleidemos’ famous anecdote about Themistokles’ stratagem appears to be in open conflict with the version of events given by Aristotle, which gives the credit for the funding of the sailors to the Areiopagos. Furthermore, since Aristotle uses this initiative to justify his thesis of the unconstitutional ascendancy of the Areiopagos from Salamis to the time of Ephialtes, the story has become an important element in theorizing about the political biases of Aristotle’s sources (see Wilamowitz 1893:1.138–40). Jacoby (*Atthis*: 75–6) elevates this result of source-criticism of the *Athenaion Politeia* into a ‘decisive’ proof of his theory of the ‘political conception’ of Atthidography. In his view, Kleidemos’ attribution of the initiative to Themistokles demonstrates his democratic bias, and Aristotle’s contrary interpretation has to be taken from a conservative response by Androtion (the Atthidographer who wrote between Kleidemos and Aristotle). Thus, by assigning a completely unfounded view to Androtion, Jacoby creates the only instance of specific disagreement between Atthidographers. I have expressed my disagreement with this idea and the historiographic method behind it already (1977:153–4)

and have seen no reason to alter that opinion. But, see Rhodes, *Commentary*: 289.

#120: Though the Herakleion has not been found, recent studies accept Phanodemos' location for Xerxes' command-post and situate it near modern Perama (e.g. Hignett 1963:220; Green 1970:189, with map p. 173; Lazenby 1993:185). They also, unlike Jacoby (*Text*: 192–3), see no conflict between this statement and Herodotos' description (8.90.4), despite the fact that he never mentions the Herakleion. Cf. Aiskhylos, *Persians*: 466–7; Ktesias, *Persika*: 26; Diodoros: 11.18.4.

#121: A similar sort of story, associating Xanthippos and a dog (his own, in this case), can be found in Plutarch, *Themistokles*: 10.10. There it has a tragic ending and a different purpose, i.e. it is designed to explain the name of a topographical reference. In this case we cannot even be sure that the story comes from either Philokhoros or Aristotle. It is not to be found in any of Aristotle's extant works and the tone appears, to Jacoby at least (*Text*: 455), too anecdotal for Philokhoros and more in the style of Kleidemos.

THE BATTLE OF PLATAIA

122. Kleidemos F22 = Plutarch, *Aristeides* 19.5: The total of those who fell fighting in defence of Greece (sc. at Plataia) was one thousand three hundred and sixty. **Of these fifty-two were Athenians, all, as Kleidemos says, from the tribe Aiantis, which fought most bravely. It was for this reason that the Aiantidai used to sacrifice to the Sphragis nymphs an offering that was required by the oracle in return for the victory, the cost of which they got from public revenue.**

Commentary

Kleidemos' figure for the Athenian casualties is exactly the same as the one in Herodotos (9.70.5), who gives it as part of his list of total casualties (91 Spartan dead, 16 Tegean, 52 Athenian). Herodotos' figures are treated as incredibly low by most commentators (e.g. How and Wells 1912:2.317; Hignett 1963:340–1; Green 1970:271; Lazenby 1993:246), though none seems to take seriously the possibility that they only related to the attack on the Persian camp, not the whole battle of Plataia. If that were the case, as Jacoby suggests (*Text*: 82), it might explain the low numbers, though I cannot see how it would also justify his further claim that it 'would explain the fact that the 52 Athenians all belonged to the same regiment'. Kleidemos' observation to that effect led Wilamowitz to infer that Kleidemos was favouring Aiantis because that was his own tribe (1893:1.286 n. 36) and others to think that he (from bias) and Herodotos (by misunderstanding) had consulted the funeral monument of only that one tribe (How and Wells 1912:2.317; Hignett 1963:14; Lazenby 1993:246). Jacoby is rightly doubtful of such speculation. He is more sensitive than others to the later tradition of the pre-eminence of Aiantis at the battle (Plutarch, *Moralia*: 628F) and links Kleidemos' emphasis upon the tribe to his knowledge of their annual sacrifice to the Sphragis nymphs, whose cult in a cave on Kithairon near the battle-site is attested by both Plutarch (*Aristeides*: 11.3–4) and Pausanias (9.3.9).

6

THE PENTEKONTAETIA AND THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

478/7–404/3

From the period of the Persian Wars onward the Atthidographers become more exclusively chroniclers of recorded facts, albeit always with an unabashedly pro-Athenian bias. It is still the case that there are huge gaps between the preserved fragments, so it is never possible to arrive at a clear understanding of the overall interpretation (if any) that the individual authors gave to any particular issue. Their usefulness remains in the details they provide, most of which are not included in the accounts of the major historians (e.g. the list of Athenian *strategoi* in 441/0 by Androtion F37).

The Pentekontaetia

THE BATTLE OF EURYMEDON

469/8–466/5

123. Phanodemos F22 = Plutarch, *Kimon* 12.6: As the Athenians bore down upon them, they (sc. the Persians) sailed out against them, **with six hundred ships, according to Phanodemos' history**, though Ephoros says (they had) three hundred and fifty.

Commentary

The date of the battle of Eurymedon is one of the most vexed chronological issues in the Pentekontaetia (for which see Thucydides: 1.89–117, with Gomme, *HCT*: 1.389–413). The chronology of that whole period is notoriously in dispute, because of Thucydides' refusal to use an absolute dating system. The details have been debated *ad nauseam*. Still useful is the analysis in Meiggs (1972:68–204). For a recent review see Rhodes (*CAH*²: 5.40–61) and Lewis (*CAH*²: 5.121–46). For the battle of Eurymedon itself Rhodes (p. 45) argues in favour of the more traditional date of 469/8, but for a different perspective see Badian (1987; 1988; 1993; *contra* Pritchett 1995:1–131).

Unfortunately, we do not have a reliable Atthidographic date for it (the account in Diodoros: 11.60–2 is confused). An archon-date would surely have improved the situation (Jacoby, *Text*: 458). There is, however, no need to re-open that debate here, since Phanodemos is cited only for the number of Persian ships at the battle. His figure (600) is far higher than any other we are given, i.e. 200 by Thucydides (1.100.1), 350 by Ephoros (here). Phanodemos has undoubtedly exaggerated the power of the enemy. This suggests that he was trying to glorify Kimon or Athens or both. Cf. #127 (Phanodemos F23).

THE MESSENIAN REVOLT FROM SPARTA

465/4 or 464/3 (Archonship of Arkhedemides)

124. Philokhoros F117/The Writers of the *Atthides* (FGrHist: 329)

F4 = Scholia to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 1138 and 1144 ('...do you not know that, when Perikleidas the Lakonian once came hither and sat as a suppliant on the altars of the Athenians, a white face in purple clothes, begging for an army (that was the time when Messene was giving you trouble along with the god's earth-shaking), then Kimon came with four thousand hoplites and saved the whole of Lakedaimon'). Scholion to 1138: **These things are recorded about the Lakedaimonians by those who have composed the *Atthides*. And Philokhoros says that the Athenians took the leadership on account of the misfortunes that restrained Lakedaimon.** Scholion to 1144: Kimon: In the twelfth year after the battle at Plataia, that was in the archonship of Theagenides (468/7). For indeed a piece of the Taygetos broke apart, and the odeion and other things and very many houses, and the Messenians started a war of revolt and the Helots were in opposition, until Kimon came in response to (Spartan) pleading and saved them.

Commentary

Even though the first part of the citation suggests that the information was common to all *Atthides*, Jacoby's discussion of this fragment is at Philokhoros F117 (*Text*: 455–61; *Notes*: 365–71). That fragment and the scholion to *Lysistrata* 1144, which I have also translated above, should perhaps be taken together. Even though the latter makes no mention of Philokhoros and is, consequently, not printed by Jacoby as one of his fragments, it is usually treated as a part of the same text, not least by Jacoby himself (*Text*: 455–61). The two raise important issues about Philokhoros' dating of the Messenian Revolt and his attitude to Athenian imperialism.

All the relevant sources for the date can be found in Fornara (no. 67). The most important are Thucydides: 1.101–3, who associates the Messenian revolt with the Athenian siege of Thasos; Diodoros: 11.63.1–64.4, who, although he dates the earthquake and start of the revolt to 469/8, believes it lasted ten years (11.84.8) and ended in 456/5; Plutarch, *Kimōn*: 16.4, who describes the earthquake and dates it to the fourth year of the reign of Arkhidamos (= 465/4); and Pausanias: 4.24.5, who dates the revolt to the archonship at Athens of Arkhimedes (Arkhedemides) (= 464/3). This information yields a variety of options, ranging from 469/8–460/59 to 465/4–456/5 (for those who accept that the revolt lasted 10 years, as Thucydides at 1.103.1 and Diodoros at 11.84.8 say) and 465/4–460/59 to 464/3–461/0 (for those who would emend the text of Thucydides). Of course, the closest to the event was Thucydides, but arriving at his date involves unravelling the whole sequence of his Pentekontaetia. There is a succinct discussion of the options by Lewis in *CAH2*: 5.500, who argues for 465/4 as the date of the earthquake and the beginning of the revolt, and 456/5 as the end (but see Badian 1993:89–95, 100–7 and Pritchett 1995:5–24).

How the information from Philokhoros (and the other *Atthides*) fits into all this is not clear. At first sight he appears to come close to Diodoros' date for the earthquake (469/8), because, even if we follow Jacoby in ignoring the reference to the archonship of Theagenides (468/7) as a marginal gloss, there is no escaping the fact that that gloss was attempting to explain the number 12 for the years from Plataia (479/8). But Jacoby suspects that number also and wants to emend it to 18 (*Text*: 460; but see Gomme, *HCT*: 1.408), largely to support his ambitious interpretation of what he thought Philokhoros was up to at

this point. In short, his idea is that Philokhoros, like Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 25.1–2) and unlike Thucydides, marked an epochal change in Athenian affairs by a domestic event, the so-called reforms of Ephialtes of 462/1, which happened 18 years after Plataia.

This is, obviously, a highly speculative construct based upon an arbitrary emendation (see Rhodes, *Commentary*: 310, who calls it irresponsible; but see Pritchett 1995:22), especially since it involves him in a contradiction with his own view of the significance of the word *hegemonia* ('leadership') to Androtion, whom he posits as Aristotle's source for Ephialtes and who was, as has been observed, often followed by Philokhoros. On Jacoby's view (e.g. *Text*: 95–102 and elsewhere. Cf. Bringmann 1965:19–28; *Androtion*: 13–25), the conservatives, or Panhellenists, of the fourth century, amongst whom he placed Isokrates and Androtion, idealized Kimon and made a distinction between *hegemonia* (the leadership of willing allies during the Kimonian period, 479–462) and *arkhe* (the naked imperialism of the rest of the fifth century). Yet, illogically, in the case of the fragment under discussion, his interpretation would see *hegemonia* result from Athens' exploitation of the Spartan misfortunes of the 460s.

Given the propensity for scholiasts to muddle and distort the information that was filtered to them by the Hellenistic scholars, Jacoby's conclusions must remain in the realm of speculation. After all, the only part of either scholion that is explicitly assigned to Philokhoros is the last sentence of the first. If that is all, it is not even impossible that Philokhoros was simply making a statement about the Athenian assertion of *hegemonia* after Plataia, somewhat like the one found at Thucydides: 1.95.7 or in Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 23.4–24.1, and that the scholiast has confused that with other information.

THE REFORMS OF EPHIALTES

462/1 (Archonship of Konon)

125. Philokhoros F64b = *Lexikon rhetoricum Cantabrigense* p. 351
10N nomophylakes: ...**They were seven (in number) and they were established, as Philokhoros says, at the time when Ephialtes left the council from the Areios Pagos only (in charge of) matters concerning the body (i.e. trials for intentional homicide).**

Commentary

This is the only statement, however confused, that has survived from the Attidographers related to Ephialtes, whose attack upon the Areiopagos in 462/1 is described in Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 25 and Plutarch, *Kimon*: 15.2; *Perikles*: 9.5, 10.7. But, since this reference occurs in a context that assigns it to Philokhoros' seventh book, and in association with other passages clearly on the same topic, it will be treated with them. See the discussion under #218a/b.

ATHENIAN WAR WITH AIGINA?

458/7? (Archonship of Habron)

126. Kleidemos F4 = Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Adikiou: Like adikema ('wrongdoing'). It is the name of a form of lawsuit at Athens. A person pays this onefold, if he makes reparation before the ninth prytany. If not, he pays down twofold. But some say 'adikion' is the penalty laid down for the wrongdoing ('adikema'). **For indeed Kleidemos in the first (book) of *Atthis* writes as follows: 'For when a sickness fell upon the Aiginetans and when they consulted the oracle (about it), their wrongdoing ("adikema") was cast in their faces as a reproach, and they were condemned to the "adikion" on this basis.'**

Commentary

The reference here must be to the feud between Athens and Aigina that is described in detail by Herodotos (5.82–9). The legal term ‘adikion’ refers to a prosecution (*graphe adikiou*) for malversation (specifically of state funds), for which the penalty was equivalent to the sum involved (cf. Aristotle, *Athēnaion Politeia*: 54.2, with Rhodes, *Commentary*, *ad loc.*; Hypereides, *Against Demosthenes*: 24, with Whitehead 2000:433–5; MacDowell 1978:171). Here, it means something like tit-for-tat.

In his lengthy digression Herodotos sets the origin of the feud in the distant past without specificity, though the details of the story suggest the early sixth century (How and Wells 1912:2.48). From the book number (i.e. one) it looks as though Kleidemos might have pushed it even further back into the mythical past, though Jacoby, ever willing to emend, thinks that a change to ‘three’ or ‘four’ is not impossible (*Text*: 64). The fragment is located tentatively here in the Pentekontaetia, because the ultimate point of departure for the story is thought to have been the war between Athens and Aigina in the 450s (How and Wells 1912:2.49), when the oracular response of Herodotos: 5.89.2 is most likely to have been invented (assuming, of course, that it is *post eventum*).

DEATH OF KIMON

450/49 (Archonship of Euthynos)

127. Phanodemos F23 = Plutarch, *Kimon* 19.1: According to the majority of sources he died of a sickness, whilst besieging Kition, though some say it was from a wound that he sustained fighting against the barbarians. **As he was dying, he ordered those around him to sail away immediately, keeping his death concealed. And it turned out that they got away safely, without either the enemy or the allies realizing it, 'with Kimon as their general', as Phanodemos says, even though he had been dead for thirty days.**

Commentary

Jacoby correctly remarks (*Text*: 191–2) that there is not enough in this fragment to enable us to decide where Phanodemos stood on some key issues related to Kimon's final campaign in Kypros, e.g. how much he had accomplished before he died and, more importantly, whether the so-called Peace of Kallias followed this campaign, as in Diodoros' account (12.3–4), or the battle of Eurymedon, as Plutarch believed (*Kimon*: 13.4–5). We cannot even be sure how he thought Kimon died, of sickness or wounds (cf. Plutarch, *Kimon*: 19.1). He is, however, our only source for this last stratagem, designed to deceive both friend and foe alike. From this we learn, at least, that he did not follow Isokrates (*On the Peace*: 86) in the view that the Athenians lost 140 ships on this campaign. This fragment also provides confirmation of the possibility raised above by F22 (#123) that Phanodemos heroized Kimon. For discussion of the date see Lewis in *CAH*²: 5.501–2; Badian 1993:58–60.

INTRODUCTION OF THE *THEORIKON*

c. 450?

128. Philokhoros F33 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. *theorika*: Demosthenes in the *Philippics* (3.11,31) (mentions this). *Theorika* was a public fund composed of revenues from the city. These were previously preserved for the needs of war and were called *stratiotika*, but later were set aside for public equipment and for distributions to the citizens on the initiative of Agyrrhios the demagogue. **Philokhoros in the third (book) of the *Atthis* says ‘the *theorikon* was at first considered “a drachma for the seat (*thea*)”, from which it derived its name’, and so on.**

Commentary

The Theoric Fund (*Theorikon*) was a subvention originally of one or two obols to enable citizens to attend the Dionysia. Plutarch (*Perikles*: 9.1) attributes its introduction to Perikles. If so, Jacoby (*Text*: 319) believes it should belong in the same context as his provision of pay for jury duty, i.e. sometime after 450. This date experiences some difficulty from the book number to which this fragment is assigned, i.e. three. On Jacoby's scheme for Philokhoros' work (*Text*: 247–8), that book ends with Ephialtes at 462/1. Once again, Jacoby advises emending the number, this time to 'six'. That would bring Philokhoros' treatment of the *Theorikon* into the time of Euboulos and Demosthenes and would assume a backward reference to its origin.

Support for this idea can be found in the phrase 'at first', which suggests some historical perspective, though the allocation of a 'drachma for a seat' is probably too high for the fifth century. At any rate, we are told by Hesykhios (s.v. *drakhme khalazosa*) that the subvention was increased to one drachma (i.e. 6 obols) in the archonship of Diophantos (395/4). This was possibly an initiative of the early fourth-century politician, Agyrrhios (on whom see *APF*, no. 8157.II and Stroud 1998:18–20). If so, it explains the reference to him in the first part of Harpokration's note. In the later fourth century the *Theorikon* became a political football between the Euboulos faction and the Demosthenes group (see *Documents*: no. 75; *Didymos*: 192–3, with bibliography).

THE SECOND SACRED WAR

448/7? (Archonship of Philiskos)

129a. Philokhoros F34a = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Birds* 556 ('...let a Holy War be proclaimed against him...'): The Sacred War took place for the Athenians against the Boiotians, because they (the Boiotians) wanted to take the oracle (i.e. at Delphi) away from the Phokians. **After (the Athenians) had been victorious, they handed (the oracle) back again to the Phokians, as Philokhoros (reports) in the fourth (book).** Two Sacred Wars took place, this one and when the Lakedaimonians attacked the Phokians.

129b. Philokhoros F34b = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Birds* 556: In some of the commentaries one finds the following... 'he is talking about the Sacred War that the Athenians fought against the Phokians over the sanctuary at Delphi', but this is pure invention on their part. For they did not fight against the Phokians over this (sanctuary), but on their behalf, out of their hostility towards the Lakedaimonians. There were two Sacred Wars. The first (was fought) by the Lakedaimonians against the Phokians over Delphi and, after they were victorious, the Lakedaimonians acquired the right of consulting the oracle first (*promanteia*) from Delphi. Later, in the third year after the first war, the Athenians (fought a war) against the Lakedaimonians on behalf of the Phokians. **And they handed back the sanctuary to the Phokians, just as Philokhoros says in the fourth (book).** It is called 'Sacred', because it was fought over the sanctuary at Delphi. It is also recorded by Thucydides (1.112.5) and Eratosthenes in the ninth (*FGrHist*: 241 F38) and Theopompos in the twenty-fifth (*FGrHist*: 115 F156).

Commentary

Though most scholars blame Philokhoros for the bulk of the information in these scholia, it is probably safest to attribute to him only the words in bold type, on the basis of the similar wording of the quotation from him in both scholia, especially since they disagree in most other respects. Of the two scholia the second is clearly better informed, though it is probably not right in placing the Athenian response to the Spartan action ‘in the third year’ (that figure is usually emended to ‘in the third month’, see e.g. Jacoby, *Text*: 320; Gomme, *HCT*: 1.337–8; but see *ATL*: 3.178 n. 65). Together the scholia form a good example of the ability of scholiasts to obfuscate and confuse. Other accounts of this war are in Thucydides (1.112.5) and Plutarch (*Perikles*: 21.1–3). Compare with Hesykhios (s.v. *hieros polemos*), who gets things essentially right: ‘A war which the Lakedaimonians fought against the Phokians over the sanctuary at Delphi. The Athenians came to the assistance of the Phokians and handed over the sanctuary to them’. The ancient reckoning for the Sacred Wars differed from ours in that they usually did not count what we consider to be the First, the one fought by the Kirrhans against the Alkmaionidai, Kleisthenes of Sikyon and the Thessalians, which ended in the archonship of Simon (591/0 according to *MP*, epoch 37; cf. Fornara, no. 16), whilst many modern scholars do not refer to the one mentioned here as a Sacred War (e.g. Lewis, *CAH*²: 5. 127), or, if they do, do so grudgingly (e.g. Gomme, *HCT*: 1.337, ‘so-called Sacred War’). Of course, the most famous Sacred War, then and now, was the Third (356–46), the one that enabled Philip II of Macedon to gain entry into Greek affairs (see Buckler, 1989).

PERIKLES REGAINS EUBOIA

446/5 (Archonship of Kallimakhos)

130. Philokhoros F118 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Clouds* 213, ‘it (sc. Euboia) was laid out by us and Perikles’: **Philokhoros says that they (sc. the Athenians) subjugated the whole (sc. of Euboia) under the generalship of Perikles, and that they settled the rest (sc. of the island) on terms, but took over the territory of the Hestiaians, whom they ejected.**

Commentary

The details reported here are confirmed by Thucydides (1.114, with Gomme, *HCT*: *ad loc.*) and also recounted by Diodoros (12.7.22) and Plutarch (*Perikles*: 22–3). The date is 446 (see Lewis in *CAH*²: 5.133–8, 502).

PSAMMETIKHOS' GIFT OF GRAIN

445/4 Archonship of Lysimakhides

131. Philokhoros F119 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 715–18 ('But whenever they are afraid, they offer you Euboia and they undertake to provide grain in fifty medimni loads. But they never gave (it) to you, except just recently (they gave you) five medimni, and you barely got barley, a pint at a time, after standing trial for non-citizenship'): Such is the extent to which citizens and non-citizens were examined closely in the distributions of grain, so that they seemed to be defendants on a charge of non-citizenship, when they were brought to trial. **So, it is Philokhoros again who says that once 4,760 were found to be illegally enrolled**, just as has been shown in the passage cited. And even the reference to Euboia can agree with the *didaskalia*. **For, the year before** (i.e. the staging of *Wasps*), **in the archonship of Isarkhos (424/3), they made a campaign against it** (sc. Euboia), **as Philokhoros says** (see #149 below). Perhaps he (sc. Aristophanes) is referring to **the gift of 30,000 medimni from Egypt, which Philokhoros says Psammetikhos sent to the people in the archonship of Lysimakhides (445/4)** (except that the numbers are totally inconsistent), **five medimni for each of the Athenians. Those who received (the grain) were fourteen thousand two hundred and forty.**

Commentary

The information in this fragment is found also in Plutarch (*Perikles*: 37.3), although with some serious differences. The least of these involves the numbers 14240 and 4,760, for which Plutarch gives 14,040 and ‘nearly five thousand’. In this case, Philokhoros’ numbers are surely more accurate (Jacoby, *Text*: 463). More serious, but unresolvable, is the question of which of the two gives the correct number of medimni of grain in Psammetikhos’ gift (i.e. 30,000 or 40,000). As some commentator astutely observed in an aside near the end of the scholion, the mathematics does not work whichever number is adopted (though see MacDowell 1971:230 for the suggestion that the reference in Aristophanes is to a separate distribution of barley in 423/2). But, the main difference relates to the context. Though both accounts are set against the background of the gift of grain, Plutarch enlarges the discussion to involve the law on citizenship that was proposed by Perikles only a few years prior to the gift (i.e. in 451/0), implies a full review of the register of citizens (*diapsephisis* or *diapsephismos*), explicitly states that the 14,040 (his figure) represented the total of confirmed citizens and states that the rejected were sold into slavery. Philokhoros, on the other hand, has none of this, although his use of the technical word *parengraphoi* to denote ‘illegally enrolled’ members could suggest that a review of the citizens took place.

The issues raised by this fragment and the discrepancy with Plutarch’s account have generated a huge literature (e.g. Jacoby alone devotes 20 pages to this one fragment; *Text*: 462–82). Discussion focuses upon three areas: 1. The citizenship law itself (for which see Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 26.4), what it entailed, why Perikles introduced it and whether and/or how it was applied in this case, i.e. was there a review of the citizen rolls such as the one that took place 100 years (coincidence?) later in 346/5 (for which see the Commentary below on Androtion/Philokhoros F52 = #206, and on the citizenship law in general see Patterson, 1981). 2. The demography of fifth-century Attika, i.e. to what extent do the numbers provided here give us any help in arriving at a reliable figure for the adult male citizen body in 445/4. The consensus on that score is not positive, if we assume that Plutarch is correctly reporting that somewhat more than 14,000 was the number of confirmed citizens. For example, Gomme, who argues for an adult male population of about 43,000 in

431/0 (1933:26), considers 14,000 'irreconcilable with all our other evidence' and insufficient for operating the machinery of government (1933:16–17), whilst that figure is even less suited to the higher number of 60,000 adult males advanced by Hansen (1988:14–28). More probably, we should assume that only a portion of the citizens applied for the grain, of whom 14,240 were approved, the rest rejected. No doubt a record was kept of the recipients. That is less likely for the rejected, however, and it is usually concluded that Philokhoros arrived at their number (4,760) by subtracting 14,240 from a total of 19,000, though where he got that number from is anyone's guess. 3. The potential impact of population growth on the food supply of fifth-century Athens is the third area of study that attempts to make use of the information in this scholion, though here again the results are not encouraging. As even the anonymous interpolator perceived, the computation does not work (i.e. neither 30,000 nor 40,000 medimni will provide 5 medimni each to 14,240 citizens). It is even argued that the scholiast is confusing two different distributions of grain (MacDowell 1971:230). See, in general, on the topic of food shortage and supply, Garnsey (1988:125–7) and Davies (CAH²: 5.299–302).

EXILE OF THUCYDIDES, SON OF
MELESIAS

444/3 (*Archonship of Praxiteles*)

132. Androtion F37/Philokhoros F120 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 946–8 (‘No, but he seems to me to have suffered that very thing that happened to Thucydides, when once he was a defendant in a lawsuit. He was suddenly struck with lockjaw’): Alternatively, (the reference is) historical. Perhaps (to) the one who was Perikles’ political opponent. **That is what Philokhoros reports (F120)...** The ostracism that took place points to the son of Melesias, that is the one who was ostracized. But Theopompos the historian (*FGrHist*: 115 F91) says that (it was) the son of Pantain<et>os, (who) was Perikles’ opponent in politics. **But not Androtion (F37), but he, too, (says it was) the son of Melesias,** (i.e. that was the one who was ostracized).

133. Androtion F57 = Marcellinus, *Life of Thucydides* 28–9: But let us not be unaware that there were many Thucydides, as well as this one, the son of Oloros. The second (was) the demagogue, son of Melesias, who was also the political rival of Perikles. The third was a Pharsalian by birth, whom Polemon mentions in his writings *About the Acropolis*, saying that he was the son of Menon. **(There is) another, fourth Thukydides, a poet, from the deme Akherdous. Androtion mentions him in his *Atthis*, writing that he was (the) son of Ariston.** According to Praxiphanes in the *About History*, he was a contemporary of Plato the comedian, Agathon the tragedian, Nikeratos the epic poet, and Khoirilos and Melanippides. And when Arkhelaos (king of Makedon, 413–399) was alive, he was for the most part without a reputation, but later he became marvellously famous.

Commentary

I have translated the text of the scholion to *Wasps*: 947 as it is found in Jacoby. It has, however, been replaced by Koster's new edition of the scholia. For a translation of that text and a detailed Commentary on these fragments see Harding (*Androtion*: 138–43, 183). No doubt the Alexandrian scholar, Didymos (on whom see *Didymos*: 1–4, 31–9), was the source, from whom the scholion ultimately derived the references to both Androtion and Philokhoros (in agreement, as so often), as Jacoby assumes in his Commentary on Philokhoros F120 (*Text*: 482–4).

THE STRATEGOI AT SAMOS

441/0 (Archonship of Timokles)

134. Androtion F38 = Scholion to Aelius Aristeides (speech 46), p. 485 (Dindorf): When he (Perikles) was acting as one of the ten generals on Samos. Scholion: **The names of the ten generals on Samos according to Androtion: Sokrates of Anagyrous, Sophokles from Kolonos the poet, Andokides of Kydathenaion, Kreon of Skambonidai, Perikles of Kholargos, Glaukon from Kerameis, Kallistratos of Akharnai, Xenophon of Melite, *Lampides of Peiraieus, Glauketes Athenaios*, Kleitophon of Thorai.**

Commentary

This important fragment contains the only complete list of all ten Athenian generals (*strategoi*) for a given year that has been handed down to us by any source. It is an excellent example of the sort of precise information that the Atthidographers (Androtion and Philokhoros, at least) provided and what we are missing by their loss. On the other hand, since the citation contains eleven names and is obviously corrupt, this fragment offers at the same time instructive evidence on the distorted lens through which we view the works of fragmentary historians. I have provided detailed Commentary on the text and the individuals listed, some of whom are very well known, in *Androtion* (143–8).

PHEIDIAS AND THE STATUE OF ATHENA

438/7 Archonship of Theodoros

135. Philokhoros F121 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Peace* 605–11 ('Pheidias began things, by getting into trouble. Next Perikles, fearing that he might get involved in his misfortune and frightened of your biting temper, set the city on fire by throwing in a little firebrand of a Megarian Decree'): **Under the archonship of (The)odoros Philokhoros says the following: 'And the golden statue of Athena was set up in the great temple, having a weight in gold of 44 talents. Perikles was the man in charge, Pheidias created it. And Pheidias, the artist, was found guilty of appearing to present fraudulent accounts for the ivory used for the fleshy parts. And fleeing to Elis, he is said to have won the contract to make the cult statue of Zeus at Olympia. When he had completed that, he was put to death by the Eleians.'** Under the archonship of (P)ythodoros (432/1), who is the seventh from this man (i.e. Theodoros), (he says that Perikles), after introducing a motion about the Megarians that they were personally shouting out slanders against the Athenians amongst the Lakedaimonians, had them excluded from the agora and the harbours throughout Athens' sphere of influence. 'For, on the motion of Perikles, the Athenians voted this decree, charging them (sc. the Megarians) with farming the land that was sacred to the goddesses.' And some say that, when Pheidias the statue-maker was deemed to have presented fraudulent accounts to the city and had fled into exile, Perikles, fearful because he had been in charge of the project and had been privy to the theft, wrote up his indictment against the Megarians and stirred up the war. His purpose in this was that, by bringing a charge against the Megarians for farming the Sacred Orgas of the Two Goddesses, he might not have to render account to the Athenians, because their efforts were otherwise engaged with the war. But this suspicion against Perikles appears unfounded, since the affair concerning Pheidias happened seven years before the war. **As Philokhoros says, in the archonship of (The)odoros Pheidias, having fashioned the statue of Athena, stole the gold from the snakes of the chryselephantine Athena, on account of which he was found guilty and condemned to exile. He went to Elis and won the contract from the Eleians to make the statue of Zeus at Olympia, but he was found guilty by them for purloining and done away with.**

Commentary

This is another important fragment that has, however, generated considerable controversy. As so often, the reporting by the scholiast leaves something to be desired, since the archons' names that he gives (Pythodoros in the first place, and Skythodoros in the second) are clearly wrong. Palm's corrections to (The)odoros (archon for 438/7) and (P)ythodoros (archon for 432/1), respectively, are adopted by Jacoby (*app. crit.*, *ad loc.*) and universally accepted (see e.g. Fornara: nos. 111 and 116; *AO*: 93 and 101). More difficult is the resolution of the disagreement between the information about Pheidias' career, exile and death contained in this fragment and that offered by Plutarch (*Perikles*: 31.2–5), which is largely (but not exclusively, see Stadter 1989:286–9) based upon the account of the fourth-century historian Ephoros (as found in Diodoros: 12.39–40). The ultimate debt of that version to Aristophanes (*Peace*: 605–11) is beyond question. The disagreement is fundamental: in Philokhoros' version Pheidias' trial and exile take place in 438/7 and have, therefore, nothing to do with the Megarian decrees and the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. Furthermore, his work on the great statue of Zeus at Olympia follows his creation of the Athena Parthenos and his imprisonment and death in Elis preclude his return to Athens. In Plutarch's account the trial, imprisonment and death all take place in Athens and are clearly set in the context of Perikles' introduction of the Megarian decrees and the start of the Peloponnesian War. Modern opinion is divided: some follow Jacoby (*Text*: 484–96) in preferring Philokhoros (see e.g. Frost 1964:385–99; Donnay 1968:19–36; Kagan 1969:194–8; de Ste. Croix 1972:236–7; Stadter 1989:295); some side with Plutarch (e.g. Platnauer 1964:120–1; Podlecki 1987:68–70); Gomme wants to have his cake and eat it, too, accepting that Pheidias went to Elis in 438/7, but returned to Athens and was tried and imprisoned in 432/1 (*HCT*: 2.184–9); while Lewis appears to ignore the issue altogether in *CAH*² (vol. 5).

Finally, one should note that Philokhoros' figure for the value of the gold on the statue, 44T, is more precise than the round number (40T) given by Thucydides (2.13.5: cf Gomme, *HCT*: 2.24–5).

FOUNDATION OF AMPHIPOLIS

437/6? (Archonship of Euthymenes)

136. Androtion F33 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Amphipolis: Antiphon (mentions this in the speech) *On the Tribute of the Lindians*. This (is) a city in Thrace. **Earlier it was called Nine Ways (Ennea Hodoi), according to Androtion in (book) twelve of Atthis.** But Marsyas (*FGrHist*: 135–6 F12) in *Makedonika* (says) that the place was named Amphipolis, because of being ‘dwelt around’, (and that it was) previously called Akra.

Commentary

The fact that Amphipolis was originally called Ennea Hodoi is also recorded by Thucydides (1.100.2–3). That Harpokration preferred to cite the Atthidographer is a reflection of the value that lexicographers set upon the *Atthis* as a source. The book number is undoubtedly incorrect, since it is most unlikely that Androtion wrote more than eight books. For possible emendations see *Androtion* (128–9).

BUILDING OF THE PROPYLAIA

437/6 Archonship of Euthymenes

137. Philokhoros F36 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. These Propylaia: ... **Concerning the Propylaia of the Acropolis, namely that the Athenians began to build them in the archonship of Euthymenes, with Mnesikles as architect, others have reported and especially Philokhoros in the fourth (book).** And Heliodoros in the first (book) of *On the Acropolis at Athens* (*FGrHist*: 373 F1) says amongst other things the following: 'It was completely constructed in five years at an expense of 2,012 talents. They made five gates (in it), through which they enter the Acropolis.'

Commentary

After the Athenians had finished the Parthenon in 438/7, they turned their attention and funding to the construction of the great entrance to the Acropolis – the Propylaia (for which see Travlos 1971:482–93; Hurwit 1999:192–7). As the accounts (*IG*, 1³: 462–6 = *IG*, 1²: 363–7) show, the building went on for five years and stopped in an incomplete state at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. The names of the secretaries in *IG*, 1³: 465 confirm the dates (see *GHI*: no. 60; Fornara: no. 118). Ephoros (in Diodoros: 12.40.2) puts the cost of the Propylaia and the Poteidaia campaign at 4000 talents and, since Thucydides (2.70.2) tells us that the eventual cost of the siege of Poteidaia was 2,000 talents, the cost of 2,012 for the Propylaia alone (a figure that did not, of course, come from Philokhoros) is probably fairly close, though some consider it too high (e.g. *ATL*: 3.124 n.15). But the cost of the Propylaia is involved in the highly contentious issue of the interpretation of Thucydides 2. 13 and the Athenian reserve fund, on which see e.g. *ATL*: 3.118–32; Wade-Gery and Meritt 1957:163–97; *contra* Gomme, *HCT*: 2.26–33. On Mnesikles, who is also named as the architect of the Propylaia by Plutarch (*Perikles*: 13.12), see Bundgaard (1957).

METON THE ASTRONOMER

433/2 Archonship of Apseudes

138. Philokhoros F122 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Birds* 997–8 (‘Who am I? I’m Meton, (a man) known to Greece and Kolonos’): A very famous astronomer and geometrician. The so-called Metonic cycle is his. Kallistratos says that there is an astrological dedication of his in Kolonos. But Euphorion (says) that he was from the deme Kolonos. Well, that is false. **For Philokhoros says he was from Leukonoion.** Kallistratos’ statement is (un)clear. Perhaps there was something also in Kolonos. **But Philokhoros says he set up nothing in Kolonos, but that in the archonship of Apseudes (the one before Pythodoros) he set up a sundial in what is now the *ekklesia*, beside the wall on the Pnyx.**

Commentary

This is another indication of the variety and precision of the information in the *Atthis*, as well as the respect attached to it by ancient scholarship. Here, Philokhoros is used to correct misinformation about the famous astronomer, Meton, that arose from incautious use of Aristophanes (who even turned him into a city planner, see Dunbar 1995:550–1) by less careful authorities.

Meton, son of Pausanias, of Leukonoion (*APF*, no. 10093) was the fifth-century mathematician who calculated the nineteen-year cycle, named after him, that related the lunar and solar systems to each other. He observed that 19 solar years corresponded closely to 235 lunar months, if 7 extra months were intercalated, one each in the third, fifth, eighth, eleventh, thirteenth, sixteenth and nineteenth years, to keep the cycles in synchronization. His system was fundamental to Greek calendric calculations (though expanded by a multiple of four by the later astronomer Kallipos) until the introduction of the Julian calendar. Both the Metonic and Kallipic cycles were featured on the so-called Antikythera Mechanism.

But, as this fragment records, he was also responsible for setting up a sundial at the Pnyx (see Travlos 1971:466–7). Here again Philokhoros provides the correct information against Diodoros (12.36.2–3), who associates this event in the archonship of Apseudes with the revelation of the Metonic cycle.

THE GYMNASION AT LYKEION

430s?

139. Philokhoros F37 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Lykeion: Demosthenes (mentions this) in the (speech) *Against Timokrates* (24.114). The Lykeion is one of the gymnasia that the Athenians have. Theopompos in the twenty-first (book) says Peisistratos constructed it (*FGrHist*: 115 F136), **but Philokhoros in the fourth (book) says that it was made when Perikles was in charge.**

Commentary

This famous gymnasium, on which see Travlos (1971:345–7), was not only the haunt of philosophers, like Sokrates (see Plato, *Symposion*: 223d; *Euthyphro*: 2a) and, of course, Aristotle, who had his school there, but was a training and parade ground for Athenian ephebes (see e.g. Aristophanes, *Peace*: 356 and the note *ad loc.* by Olson 1998:144).

MILITARY ORGANIZATION AT ATHENS BEFORE THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

432/1? (Archonship of Pythodoros)

140. Philokhoros F38 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Call-up by eponymi: Aiskhines (mentions this) in the (speech) *On the Embassy* (2.168). What the call-up by the eponymi was has been revealed by Aristotle in *Athenaion Politeia* (53.4), where he says: 'For there are eponymi for the tribes, 10 (in number), and for the age-groups (*helikiai*), 42. The ephebes registered for the levy were previously listed on whitened boards of wood, and there were listed with them the (name of) the archon, in whose term they were registered, and (the name of) the eponymous hero of the citizens who served as arbitrators (*diaitetai*) for the previous year, but now they are recorded before the boule' ('on a bronze stele', *Athenaion Politeia*: 53.4). And a little further on (53.7) he says: 'They use the (age-group) heroes for campaigns as well, and whenever they send out an age-group, they proclaim (that those on the list) from a certain archon <and> a certain (age-group) hero up to certain (others) are to go on campaign.'

Philokhoros also has written in detail about these in the fourth (book) of *Atthis*.

141. Philokhoros F39 = Hesykhios, *Lexikon* s.v. Horsemen. Horse-riding. 'But the horsemen are one thousand noble men.' A company of one thousand fighting men rearing horses. **Philokhoros in the fourth (book) has written that at one time their number was established at one thousand. For the Athenians had different numbers of cavalry at different times.**

Commentary

On the basis of the book number Jacoby treats these two fragments together and considers them part of an extensive digression by Philokhoros on Athenian military resources at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, similar to that found in Thucydides (2.13.6–9). Certainly the figure of 1,000 cavalymen (hippeis) in F39 is consistent with the known strength at that time (Thucydides: 2.13.8 with Gomme, *HCT*: *ad loc.*; Aristophanes, *Knights*: 225; Spence 1987:167–75; Bugh 1988:79–119). On the other hand, the reference to the eponymi of the so-called Helikian hero-cycles is, as Harpokration recognized, most like the description of the fourth-century practice in Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 53 4. In fact, it led Wilamowitz (1893:1.225–6) to the view that Aristotle had derived his information from Philokhoros at this point. His view is rejected by Rhodes, *Commentary*: 592–3.

The Peloponnesian War

BEGINNING OF THE WAR

432/1 Archonship of Pythodoros

142. Philokhoros F123 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Peace* 990 ('We are already worn out for thirteen years...'): The statement is inconsistent with the dates. Moreover in the *Akharnians* (266) he says, 'In the sixth year *I have looked upon you (coming) into the territory' (Aristophanes, 'I have greeted you, after coming to my deme'). **And yet Philokhoros, computing the time from (the archonship) of Pythodoros (432/1), in whose time the beginning of the war was deemed to have taken place, up to (the archonship) of Isarkhos (424/3), produces a total of *13 years.** Furthermore, even Thucydides (4.116.3), while saying that the war took place according to the beginnings of winters and summers, does not come to this number, but falls short of reaching nine years.

143. Philokhoros F124 = Scholion to Euripides, *Andromakhe* 445 ('O most hateful of mortals in the eyes of all mankind, inhabitants of Sparte'): In the guise of Andromakhe Euripides says these words, abusing the Spartiates for the impending war. **Certainly, indeed, they broke their treaty with the Athenians, as Philokhoros and company report.** It is not possible to grasp the date of the drama with absolute certainty. For it has not been produced at Athens.

144. Philokhoros F125/Androtion F39 = Scholion to Sophokles, *Oidipous at Kolonos* 698–705 ('...a growth unworsted, self-creating, cause of fear for the spears of the enemy...leaf of the grey olive...for the ever-watching eye of Morian Zeus and owl-eyed Athena look upon it'): **That the Lakedaimonians kept their hands off the sacred olive trees (*moriai*) is recorded both by others and Philokhoros (F125),** so that in truth they were objects of fear for the enemy's spears. **For when the Lakedaimonians invaded Attika with (?)x10,000 Peloponnesians and Boiotians under the leadership of Arkhidamos, son of Zeuxidamos, king of the Lakedaimonians, they kept their hands off the so-called *moriai* out of fear for Athena, as Androtion says.**

Commentary

#142: The scholiast's attempt to explain the figure of 13 years in Aristophanes by using historical computations is probably misguided. The number thirteen was used to indicate an indefinite number, rather like our 'dozen' (Jacoby, *Text*: 498–9; Platnauer 1964:150). But that does not explain the figure he ascribes to Philokhoros. That is manifestly in error on any system of reckoning (inclusive or exclusive) and is hardly likely to have originated with Philokhoros (Jacoby, *Text*: 498, *Notes*: 404, n. 5). Indeed, while he would certainly have recorded the names of the archons under whom (1) the war began (Pythodoros; cf. Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 27.2) and (2) either the truce of Lakhes of 424/3 was agreed upon (Isarkhos) or, as the alternative version of the scholion has it, (3) the Peace of Nikias was concluded (Alkaios), it is less certain that as a chronicler he would have felt the need to compute the number of intervening years.

#143: The scholiast's difficulty remains ours, since neither he nor we can date the historical allusions in Euripides' *Andromakhe* with any certainty. The implication here is that it was Athenian reaction to the breaking of the Thirty Years' Peace and other Spartan acts of hostility at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, like the attack on Plataia, that generated the anti-Spartan tone of the references in the play. Others, however, think that *Andromakhe*'s outburst is an allusion to the activities of Brasidas in Thrace in 423, after the conclusion of the truce of Lakhes (see #148), or, even later, to the failure of Sparta to follow through on the commitments in the Peace of Nikias in 421/0. See the reviews in Stevens (1971:15–21) and Lloyd (1994:11–12).

#144: For discussion of this fragment and the problems associated with it, especially of the missing multiplier of 10,000, and the significance of the sacred olive trees, see *Androtion* (148–50).

PHORMION

428/7 (Archonship of Diotimos):

145. Androtion F8 = Aristophanes, *Peace* 347: 'I endured many troubles and straw-mattresses, such as fell to Phormion's lot'.

Scholion: **This Phormion (was) an Athenian by birth, the son of Asopios, who became a poor man, after performing his duties as a general (*strategos*) honestly. When he had been deprived of his citizenship for not being able to pay the 100 minas (fine?) at his scrutiny (*euthyna*), he spent his time in the country, until the Akarnanians requested him as general. But he refused, saying that it was not permitted for the disenfranchised (sc. to be generals). And the *demos*, wishing to annul his disfranchisement, gave a contract to him for Dionysos (valued at) the 100 minas, as Androtion (says) in (book) three of *Attika*.**

Commentary

For the relevance of this fragment to our knowledge of the career of the famous Athenian general, Phormion, see my discussion (*Androtion*: 99–104).

ATHENIAN GENERALS IN SICILY

426/5 (Archonship of Euthynos)

146. Philokhoros F127 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 240 ('Let's get a move on, you fellows. It will be Lakhes' trial today...'): He says this, because Kleon brought Lakhes to trial. Demetrios (*FGrHist*: 228 F1–3) says that he was general three years before (i.e. the production of the play) in the archonship of Eukles (427/6) and that he was sent to Sicily with ships to help the people of Leontinoi. **And Philokhoros and company say that he was succeeded by Sophokles and Pythodoros, the ones who were punished by exile.** At any rate, it is likely that he was recalled to face the trial that the comic playwright mentions.

Commentary

The scholiast has cited Philokhoros for one specific detail, namely that Sophokles and Pythodoros replaced Lakhes in Sicily and were subsequently tried and exiled. He does not use him to explicate the reference to a prosecution of Lakhes by Kleon. No doubt that means that he did not find any reference to such a prosecution in the *Atthidographer*, as Jacoby suggests (*Text*: 500–1). Nor did he find any mention in Thucydides, whose narrative of Athenian activities in Sicily is spread over several chapters (3.86.1, 115.2, 115.5), ending with the trial and exile of Pythodoros and Sophokles and fining of Eurymedon (4.65.3). The fact that the historian and the chronicler agree on the information they provide and are equally silent about a prosecution of Lakhes raises considerable doubts about the veracity of Aristophanes' statement (see Jacoby, *Text*: 500–1), though most scholars want to find some value in it (e.g. Gomme, *HCT*: 2.430–1; MacDowell 1971:163–5). But that is a problem for students of Aristophanes. For the historian the issue is clear: there is no evidence that Lakhes was ever put on trial and he definitely was not found guilty of any wrongdoing, since he continued to serve Athens until his death in 418 at the battle of Mantinea.

SPARTAN OVERTURES TO ATHENS OVER
PYLOS

426/5 Archonship of Euthynos

147a. Philokhoros F128a = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Peace* 665 ('She says she came of her own accord after the events in Pylos, bringing the city a basket full of treaties, but was voted down three times in the Assembly'): **Philokhoros writes as follows: 'The Lakedaimonians sent ambassadors to the Athenians regarding a cessation of hostilities, after making a truce with the commanders at Pylos and after handing over their ships, which were sixty in number. But when Kleon spoke out against the peace treaty, it is said that the Assembly was divided in opinion. Eventually, the president put the question and those who wanted to go on fighting won the day.'** Alternatively: After the affair at Pylos. **For in the time of Kleon, when the Lakedaimonians sent ambassadors, there was a difference of opinions in the Assembly, as Philokhoros says.**

Following the affair at Pylos and the captured men, whom Kleon took, the Lakedaimonians sent to the Athenians (men) offering that they would give back the triremes of the Athenians that they had captured in the war, and at the same time (making overtures) about a peace treaty. Then, at that time Kleon spoke in opposition, and when the president asked the council (*boule*) for the third time what it wanted, peace or war, the council chose to continue the war.

147b. Philokhoros F128b = Scholion to Lucian, *Timon*, 30: **He (sc. Kleon) put a stop to the peace with the Lakedaimonians, as Philokhoros (says), under the heading 'the archon was Euthynos'.** Aristotle in *Politeia* (*Athenaion Politeia*: 28. 3) says he made his speeches with his tunic girded up.

Commentary

Obviously what is being related here is the armistice at Pylos of 425 and the embassy of the Spartans to Athens described in greater detail by Thucydides (4.15.1–23.1). It shows once again that the Atthidographers made use of literary (in this case Thucydides) material, as well as the documentary. From documentary sources Philokhoros supplied the detail, lacking in Thucydides, that a vote was actually taken in the Assembly. (See Jacoby, *Text*: 501–3.)

SIEGE OF SKIONE

424/3 Archonship of Isarkhos

148. Philokhoros F129 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 210 ('Yes, by Zeus, it would be better for me to be keeping watch over Skione rather than this father'): **Under the archonship of Isarkhos Philokhoros says that the Athenians, in response to Brasidas' causing the Skionaians to revolt from Athens in the previous year, dispatched 50 ships and first captured Mende, then put Skione under siege.**

Commentary

The revolt of Skione took place just after the truce of 424/3 between Athens and Sparta had been negotiated and before Brasidas had been informed. The revolt and the reaction of Athens are described by Thucydides in the final chapters of book four (120–33). He narrates the devastating conclusion, the utter destruction of the city, the slaughter of its men and enslavement of the women and children – one of the worst atrocities of the war – at 5.32.1. The wording of this extract from Philokhoros is at points so close to that of Thucydides that it provides further proof for his use of the historian. He does, however, supply the name of the archon, so rigorously eschewed by Thucydides. The *Wasps* was staged in 423/2, the year following the archonship of Isarkhos (424/3).

ATHENIAN CAMPAIGN AGAINST EUBOIA

149. Philokhoros F130 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 718 ('But whenever they are afraid, they offer you Euboia and they undertake to provide grain in fifty medimni loads'): And even the reference to Euboia can agree with the *didaskalia*. **For, the year before** (i.e. the staging of *Wasps*), **in the archonship of Isarkhos (424/3), they made a campaign against it** (sc. Euboia), as **Philokhoros says** (cf. #131 above).

Commentary

We know nothing about this otherwise unrecorded event (see MacDowell 1971:230).

DEATH OF KLEON

422/1 Archonship of Alkaios

150. Androtion F40 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Clouds* 549–50 ('I'm the one who struck Kleon in the belly when he was at the height of his power, and I didn't have the heart to jump on him when he was down'): Kleon dies in the archonship of Ameinias (423/2). Before him (sc. Ameinias) is Isarkhos (424/3), in whose archonship the first *Clouds* was produced. **But *this man* Androtion says that Kleon died in the archonship of Alkaios (422/1), the man who followed Ameinias, two years after the production of the *Clouds*.**

Commentary

The text of this scholion is corrupt. There is now a new edition by Koster (1977:123–4), which relegates the awkward phrase ‘this man’ to the *apparatus criticus*. Nevertheless, the date that Androtion assigned to the death of Kleon is clear and is also undoubtedly correct (see my discussion in *Androtion*: 150–1).

PANAKTON

151. Androtion F9 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika*, s.v. Panakton:
A fort in Attika, as Androtion (says) in (book) three of *Atthis*.

Commentary

Panakton was an important Athenian fort on the border between Attika and Boiotia. It was betrayed to the Boiotians in 422/1 (Thucydides: 5.3.5), and that is probably the occasion of its mention by Androtion. For what we know of the history of the fort see *Androtion* (104–6).

PEACE OF NIKIAS

152. Philokhoros F131 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Peace* 466 ('The Boiotians will lament'): Because the peace does not concern them. **For Philokhoros says that in the archonship of Alkaios a fifty-year peace treaty was concluded between the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians and their allies, with the exception of the Boiotians, the Corinthians and the Eleians.**

153. Philokhoros F132 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Peace* 475–7 ('And these Argives here have not been pulling their weight for some time, but only laughing at those who are worn out with effort, while they are getting paid their wages in barley from both sides'): **And Philokhoros says that the Corinthians, stirring up war again, tried to get even the Argives on their side.**

Commentary

Jacoby associates these references, quite appropriately, with Thucydides 5.27. On the passage in Aristophanes see Olson 1998:175–6).

BATTLE OF MANTINEIA

418/17 (Archonship of Antiphon)

154. Androtion F41 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Birds* 13 ('Yes, the guy in the bird-market (*orneon*) did the pair of us in...'): Didymos says they were 'done in' by the *orneon*, because Orneai is a place in Lakonia. **And four years before they came off badly at Mantinea with the result that even the generals, Lakhes and Nikostratos, were lost (thrown away?), as Androtion also says.**

Commentary

The campaign at Mantinea of 418/17 is recounted by Thucydides at 5.61.1–5.74.3. He confirms the presence of both these generals (5.61.1) and their demise (5.74.3). See also Diodoros: 12.79.1–7. For a study of the topography of the area and the three important battles that took place there see Pritchett (1969:37–72) and for discussion of this fragment and the careers of Lakhes and Nikostratos see Harding (*Androton*: 151–2).

OSTRACISM OF HYPERBOLOS

417/16 (Archonship of Euphemos)

155. Androtion F42 = Scholion to Lucian, *Timon* 30 (Wealth: ‘Kind of you to take me by the hand, Hermes, since, if you leave me here, I’ll soon bump into Hyperbolos or Kleon while I’m hanging around’).
Scholion: **This Hyperbolos, as Androtion says, was the son of Antiphanes, (from the deme) Perithoidai, and that he had also been ostracized for his worthlessness.**

Commentary

Ostraka have vindicated Androtion's accuracy regarding the name of Hyperbolos' father against the rest of the ancient tradition. For details on this and the other issues raised by this fragment see my lengthy discussion (*Androtion*: 152–61) and for a somewhat different perspective see Rhodes (1994:85–98). Rosenbloom (2004:55–105, 323–358) offers a more imaginative exploration of the evidence.

THE LINEAGE OF THE ORATOR
ANDOKIDES

416/15? (Archonship of Arimnestos)

156a. Hellanikos F24a = [Plutarch], *Moralia* 834B (Photios, *Bibliotheka* 261 p. 488 a 23): Andokides' father was Leogoras, <the son of Andokides>, the one who at some time made a peace-treaty with the Lakedaimonians for the Athenians (446/5). His deme was either Kydathenaion or Thorai; his family was of the *eupatridai*.

According to Hellanikos, he was also descended from Hermes. For he belonged by lineage to the clan of the Kerykes. Wherefore he was selected once upon a time together with Glaukon to give assistance with (a squadron of) twenty ships to the Kerkyraians in their dispute with the Corinthians (432/1). Later on (416/15), he was accused of impious behaviour, on the grounds that he in person mutilated the Herms and abused the Mysteries of Demeter. He was brought to trial on these charges and was sent into exile on condition that he would give information against those who committed the crimes.

156b. Hellanikos F24b = Plutarch, *Alkibiades* 21.1: Amongst those who were imprisoned at that time (416/5) and kept under guard with a view to (their standing) trial, **one was also Andokides the rhetor, whose lineage was traced back to the descendants of Odysseus by Hellanikos the historian.** **156c. Hellanikos F24c** = *Souda* s.v.

Andokides: An Athenian, a rhetor, one of the ten canonical ones, the son of Leogoras, **a descendant of Telemakhos, son of Odysseus, and Nausikaa, as Hellanikos says.**

Commentary

It is not surprising to find the mythographer, Hellanikos, cited for the lineage of this famous (or infamous) aristocratic Athenian family. The format is standard, tracing the line ultimately back to a god (Hermes), via the son of a hero (Telemakhos, son of Odysseus). The aberrant association with the Kerykes is not from Hellanikos (Jacoby, *Text*: 53). The retrospective note may have been entered under 432/1, when Andokides was in some way (but not as a *strategos*, see *IG*, I³: 364) involved with Glaukon's expedition to Kerkyra, or under 416/15, when he was notoriously involved with the Mutilation of the Herms. Jacoby's long discussion (*Text*: 51–4, *Notes*: 65–8) is still worth reading, though it has been superseded by MacDowell (1962:1–6) and Davies' treatment of the whole family history (*APF*: no. 828).

THE MUTILATION OF THE HERMS,
PROFANATION OF THE MYSTERIES AND
OTHER BAD OMENS BEFORE THE
SICILIAN EXPEDITION

**416/5–415/4 (Archonship of Arimnestos) – Archonship of
Kharrias**

157. Kleidemos F10 = Pausanias 10.15.4: They (sc. the Athenians) dedicated the bronze date-palm (at Delphi), both it and the gold-covered statue of Athena beside it, from their (two) successful campaigns at Eurymedon, (both of which were carried out) on the same day, the one by land, the other with their ships on the river. I saw that the gold on this statue had in some places been damaged. For my part I laid the blame for this upon evildoers and thieves, **but Kleitodemos, the most ancient of those who wrote the local affairs of the Athenians, says in his *Attic account*, that when the Athenians were preparing their expedition against Sicily a countless host of crows landed on Delphi at that time and pecked at this statue and broke the gold off from it with their beaks. He says also that the spear and the owls and all the fruit that had been wrought on it in imitation of a harvest, these too were broken off by the crows. Moreover, Kleitodemos has narrated other omens also that the Athenians received telling them not to sail to Sicily.**

158. Philokhoros F133 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 1094 ('...so that no one of the Hermokopidai will see you'): (The reference is relevant) to the extent that the Hermokopidai mutilated the Herms at their extremities, at the time when he was about to set sail for Sicily....Some ascribe the blame for this to Alkibiades and his supporters, for example, Thucydides (6. 27–8). **Others, like Philokhoros, blame the Corinthians. He says that only Andokides' Herm was <not> mutilated.**

159. Philokhoros F134 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Birds* 766 ('If the son of Peisias wants to betray the gates to the outlaws....'): We know nothing for sure (about) who the son of Peisias (was), nor about his treachery. That he was one of the very base men is made clear by Kratinos in (his plays) *Kheirones*, *Pylaia*, *Horai*. The son of Peisias could be a person who shared in the activities of the Hermokopidai, **men who, as Philokhoros says, were condemned to death in the archonship of Khabrias; their names were written up on a marble stele, <their property> was sold at public auction and (a reward of) one talent was announced in public for anyone who killed any of them.**

Commentary

#157: The story is told with virtually the same details by Plutarch, *Nikias*: 13.5–7. In all likelihood Kleidemos (Pausanias regularly calls him Kleitodemos) was the source for these and other stories of portents presaging disaster for the Sicilian expedition (a sample of which can be found in Plutarch, *Nikias*: 13.7–11). This only strengthens the perception created by other fragments that Kleidemos was fond of anecdotal material. The fact that Pausanias refers to Kleidemos as ‘the most ancient of those who wrote the local affairs of the Athenians’ is usually understood to mean that he was the first Athenian to write an *Atthis* (see Introduction, above).

#158–9: The Mutilation of the Herms and the Profanation of the Mystery cult of Demeter and Persephone was, of course, the most celebrated of the negative portents that occurred before the Sicilian Expedition. The events are well known from the accounts of Thucydides (6.27–9), Plutarch (*Nikias*: 13.3, *Alkibiades*: 18–21) and, of course, Andokides the orator in his subsequent defence, *On the Mysteries*. The details have been much discussed. Useful interpretations can be found in Dover (*HCT*: 4.264–90), MacDowell (1962: *passim*), Furley (1996: *passim*) and, in general, Kagan (1981:192–209).

Of the details that are here attributed to Philokhoros, the notion that the Corinthians were to blame is the most controversial. Though he is not alone in holding this view either in antiquity (see [Plutarch] *Lives of the Ten Orators* = *Moralia* 834D, who cites the usually respectable Kratippos; Plutarch, *Alkibiades*: 18.7; Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Hermokopidai) or in more recent times (for some adherents to that view see Kagan 1981:207, n. 67), it is not popular today. It is not likely that Philokhoros created this interpretation by himself, however, since it was clearly spoken of at the time. Otherwise, his information is accurate: Andokides’ Herm was not mutilated, as he himself reported (*On the Mysteries*: 62; cf. Plutarch, *Nikias*: 13.3); the trial and condemnation had been concluded within the archonship of Kharias (415/14; the name Khabrias was a common error in the scholia and in Diodoros: 13.2.1, see *AO*: 149); and the names of the condemned with the value of their auctioned property were inscribed upon marble stelai (the so-called Attic Stelai, *IG*, I³: 421–30; cf. Fornara: no. 147). To be sure, the name Peisias does not occur on those stelai, but then Philokhoros did not say it did. The scholiast is responsible for that

idea.

DEATH (?) OF PERDIKKAS, KING OF MAKEDONIA

414/3? (Archonship of Teisandros)

160. Philokhoros F126 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 5.58 p. 217 DE: **Well then Perdikkas was king before Arkhelaos.** According to Nikomedes of Akanthos (he ruled) for 41 years, according to Theopompos (*FGrHist*: 115 F279) 33 years, Anaximenes (*FGrHist*: 72 F27) says 40, Hieronymos (*FGrHist*: 154 F1) says 38, but Marsyas (*FGrHist*: 135–6 F15) **and Philokhoros say 23.**

Commentary

Unfortunately we are poorly informed about the reigns of the early kings of Macedon. This is nowhere more clear than in the present case, where Perdikkas II is given regnal periods of such disparity. It might be unwise to favour any one of the offerings, though Philokhoros may have been well advised to follow the figure given by Marsyas, who was in a particularly good position to know reliable details about the Macedonian royal house, if, that is, he was the historian from Pella (on whom see Heckel 1980:444–62; *Didymos*: 26–7, 234–6, 239–41). The cautious approach, favoured by Hammond (Hammond and Griffith 1979:115), tries to explain the discrepant dates by assuming that Perdikkas' reign had been 'insecure and disputed from c.452 to c.435 but fully recognised thereafter until his death c.413'. Hammond provides a review of Perdikkas' career (1979:115–36) and a stemma of the sons of Alexander I, of whom Perdikkas was one, opposite page 176.

DEATH OF THE SEER, STILBIDES, AND
DEFEAT OF THE SICILIAN EXPEDITION

413/12 (Archonship of Kleokritos)

161a. Philokhoros F135a = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Peace* 1032 ('At any rate the kindled fire-wood is bothering Stilbides'): Stilbides was a highly reputed and celebrated seer amongst those who expounded oracles long ago....Alternatively: **The seer Stilbides, whom Philokhoros says accompanied <Nikias?> in Sicily, when the Athenians fought and campaigned against Sicily.** Eupolis also mentions him in (his play) *Poleis*.

161b. Philokhoros F135b = Plutarch, *Nikias* 23.1, 7–8: But when everything was ready (sc. for the Athenian retreat from Syracuse) and none of the enemy was on guard, because they did not expect anything, the moon was eclipsed during the night. (This was) a cause of great fear to Nikias and to any others who through inexperience or superstition were terrified by such things... However, it chanced that at that time Nikias did not even have an experienced seer with him, for his friend and associate Stilbides, the man who relieved him of a large part of his superstitious fear, had died shortly before. (His advice was missed), since, **as Philokhoros says, the portent was not disadvantageous, but in fact very useful, to men who were trying to escape. For actions (that are carried out) in fear require concealment. Light, on the other hand, is inimical to those (involved in such activities).**

Commentary

Plutarch may well have derived all his information about the important relationship between Nikias and Stilbides from Philokhoros, even though he only cites him for the interpretation of the unfortunate eclipse that delayed the Athenian retreat from Syracuse in August 413 (for which see Thucydides: 7.50.4; Diodoros 13.12.6). From the two fragments it is clear that Philokhoros wrote a fairly extensive note on the seer. Jacoby (*Text*: 507–8) makes the felicitous observation that Philokhoros, a seer himself, had professional interest in Stilbides and took this opportunity to demonstrate his own skill by adding his own interpretation. For some suggestions on the point of the humour in the line from Aristophanes see Platnauer (1964:153).

AN AMNESTY FOR EXILES AFTER THE DEFEAT IN SICILY?

162. Philokhoros F137 = Marcellinus, *Life of Thucydides* 32:

Didymos (says that Thucydides died) a violent death in Athens after returning from exile. For the Athenians granted (the right of) return to their exiles, except the Peisistratidai, after their defeat in Sicily. So, (he says) that he was murdered after his return... **But it is clear that (the right of) return was granted to those in exile, as Philokhoros says** and Demetrios (of Phaleron = *FGrHist*: 228 F3) in *Archons*.

Commentary

Though there is no other specific reference to an amnesty for exiles after the failure of the Sicilian Expedition, there are, as Jacoby observed (*Text*: 508–9), hints in the narrative of Thucydides that something of the sort was voted, even though it may not have been implemented. In his account, when the news came, the mood of the people was in favour of reconciliation and working together (8.1), but the oligarchic revolution of the Four Hundred intervened. Thucydides claimed that the oligarchs had their own reasons for not wanting the exiles to return, namely fear of Alkibiades (8.70.1). It is not, however, at all likely that Thucydides took advantage of the opportunity to return at this time. His return and death followed the general amnesty of 404 after the defeat of Athens (Thucydides: 5.26.5).

THE *SYNGRAPHEIS*

412/11 Archonship of Kallias

163. Androtion F43/Philokhoros F136 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. *Syngrapheis* (compositors, commissioners for the drafting of laws): Isokrates (in the) *Areiopagitikos* (7.58). It was a practice amongst the Athenians, whenever necessary, to select a certain number (of men), who introduced proposals before the *demos* at an appointed day. And this happened also before the establishment of the Four Hundred, as Thucydides says in his (book) eight (8.67.1). ‘At this crucial moment Peisandros’ faction arrived and immediately took control of the remaining details. And first they assembled the *demos* and proposed that ten men be chosen as compositors (*syngrapheis*) with full authority, and that when these men had composed (their ideas) they should bring forth a proposal before the *demos* at an appointed day regarding the way the city will be managed best.’ **But the total (number of) compositors/commissioners (*syngrapheis*) who were elected at that time were thirty, as both Androtion and Philokhoros say, each one in his *Atthis*.** But Thucydides was only making mention of the ten *probouloi*.

Commentary

Even for the history of the fifth century Philokhoros often derived his material from Androtion, as he clearly did here. The number of *Syngrapheis* given by the Atthidographers is confirmed by Aristotle (*Athēnaion Politeia*: 29.2, with Rhodes, *Commentary, ad loc.*). For other points raised by this fragment, especially what it says about Aristotle's relationship to Androtion, see the discussion in *Androtion* (161–2).

THE ATHENIANS BEGIN TO USE THE RESERVE FUND

164. Philokhoros F138 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 173–4 (‘Not while their triremes have feet and they have a bottomless (supply of) money in the goddess’ house’): The Athenians would not make peace so long as they control the sea and have the bottomless (supply of) money in the goddess’ temple on the Acropolis. **For the truth is that one thousand talents were laid up there. Indeed, they began to remove it in the archonship of Kallias, in whose time the play (sc. the *Lysistrata*) was produced, as Philokhoros tells in *Atthis*.**

Commentary

Thucydides (8.15.1) recorded the same extreme action by the Athenians, of using the Reserve Fund that Perikles had wisely set on the Acropolis (Thucydides: 2.13.4–5), without giving the archon's name, as the Atthidographers did. Quite often, as here, we find the historical information, put out by the Atthidographers, associated not only with an archon's name, but with some other documentary referencing system, in this case the *didaskalia* (production dates for the performances of the dramas). This is further evidence of their use of documents. The interest in theatrical performances and the careers of poets and playwrights is reflected in the chronological lists of the Hellenistic period. For comment on the passage in Aristophanes see Henderson (1987:88–9).

KLEOPHON PERSUADES THE ATHENIANS
TO REJECT SPARTAN OVERTURES FOR
PEACE

411/10 Archonship of Theopompos

165a. Philokhoros F139a = Scholion to Euripides, *Orestes* 371 ('Supposing Orestes'): All the words of Menelaos are deceitful; on this basis the poet makes fun of the unstable state of Lakedaimonian opinion, as (he does) also in *Andromakhe* (445 f.), 'O most hated of mankind to all humanity, you inhabitants of Sparta, counsellors of treachery'. For before (the archonship of) Diokles (409/8), in whose time the *Orestes* was produced, **when Lakedaimonian ambassadors came (to negotiate) about peace, the Athenians rejected them because they did not trust them, in the archonship of Theopompos, who preceded Diokles. So Philokhoros records.**

165b. Philokhoros F139b = Scholion to Euripides, *Orestes* 772 ('A terrible thing is the mob'): This is a veiled allusion to Kleophon who two years previously obstructed the treaty. Alternatively: Perhaps it is a veiled allusion to the political leadership in his time, and maybe to Kleophon. **For, two years before the production of the *Orestes*, he was the one who prevented a treaty being concluded between the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians, as Philokhoros records.**

Commentary

The time was the late Spring (Kagan 1987:252) or Summer (Lewis 1977:114) of 410, following the destruction of the Spartan fleet under Mindaros. An embassy led by the ephor, Endios, brought proposals for peace to Athens, maybe motivated by a desire to recover Spartan prisoners held by the Athenians (Lewis 1977:126, though see Kagan 1987:248 n. 6). Besides the entry in Philokhoros, the most complete ancient account (but with the wrong date) is by Diodoros (13.52–3), who may have been using (with embellishments) the usually reliable *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* (Lewis 1977:114 n. 4; cf. Kagan 1987:248 n. 10). Most ancient and modern sources judge that Athens was unwise to reject this offer and, consequently, Kleophon, who successfully opposed acceptance, has received a bad press. He is, like all the other hardliners (especially, Kleon and Hyperbolos), treated harshly by the comic poets, a fact which greatly influenced the later tradition about them. For a reasoned evaluation of this whole incident, see Kagan (1987:248–51).

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES AFTER THE RESTORATION OF DEMOCRACY

410/9 Archonship of Glaukippos

166. Philokhoros F140 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Ploutos* 972 ('Well, were you drinking at the letter [i.e. in court], though your name had not been drawn'): That they were drawn in the lottery by letters has been pointed out previously. Moreover, they served on the council in this way also, starting from the year before this. **For, Philokhoros says under the archonship of Glaukippos: 'And then for the first time (the members of) the *boule* began to take their seats by the letter. And still nowadays they take an oath from his time that they will sit at the letter by which their name was drawn.'**

Commentary

Philokhoros is the only source to mention this modification to the operation of the *Boule*, which is, nevertheless, undoubtedly historical fact (see e.g. Rhodes 1972:33 n. 4, 146 n. 3, 192 n. 3, 194). It rightly belongs with the legislation of the restored democracy, such as the decree of Demophantos (Andokides, *On the Mysteries*: 96–8), designed to protect the constitution from subversion following the expulsion of the Four Hundred and the demise of the Five Thousand (Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 34.1). The Council was an especial target, as can be seen from *IG*, I³: 105 – a poorly preserved law limiting the powers of the *Boule*, one clause of which may well have been this one (see the reconstruction of the law in Rhodes 1972:194–7). This provision was presumably meant to prevent collusion and vote-packing by groups of like-minded councillors sitting together. From this point on seats were assigned by lot, using a *kleroterion*.

SPARTAN EMBASSY TO ATHENS FOR AN EXCHANGE OF PRISONERS

408/7 Archonship of Euktemon

167. Androtion F44 = Scholion to Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea* 5.7.1134b22 ('To ransom for a mina'): For the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians made this agreement in their war against each other, namely to ransom prisoners for a mina. **Androtion makes mention of this agreement. 'Euktemon of Kydathenaion: In the archonship of this man Megillos and Endios and Philokharidas came as ambassadors from Lakedaimon to Athens.'** And he continues: **'Taking a mina for each of the survivors/surplus they gave (them) back.'** For he said beforehand that they had made this agreement in the case of those who were captured.

Commentary

The text of this scholion is quite corrupt, but the emendations of Usener (1912:205–6) have rendered it comprehensible and are generally accepted. They create the only extant evidence for Androtion's use of the formula (archon's name, followed by the phrase 'in the archonship of this man') that we find frequently for Philokhoros and that Jacoby has claimed was the standard format for the chronicle (*Atthis*: 97–8). The situation was similar to that found above (#165), in this case probably caused by the capture of Spartan citizens in Byzantion by Alkibiades. It would be repeated again in 406/5, after the battle of Arginousai (Aristotle, *Athēnaion Politeia*: 34.1). For a fuller discussion see *Androtion* (162–4).

THE RETURN OF ALKIBIADES TO ATHENS

***408/7 (Archonship of Euktemon) or 407/6 Archonship of
Antigenes (?)***

168. Androtion F45 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1422 ('Well now, what opinion does each of you have about Alkibiades'): The reference is to his second departure. He had returned from exile in the archonship of Antigenes (407/6), a year before the *Frogs*, but went into exile of his own accord, because the Athenians were angry with him for having entrusted the fleet to his helmsman, Antiokhos, and for being defeated by Lysander. **Androtion differs from Xenophon (*Hellenika*: 1.4.13ff.) about his return.**

Commentary

This opaque statement (that Androtion differed from Xenophon about the date of Alkibiades' return) is hardly helpful in resolving one of the major chronological issues of the narrative of this period (see Andrewes in *CAH*²: 5.503–4). We cannot be sure which date Androtion assigned to the return of Alkibiades, but at least we can say that he did not accept the date given in this scholion (archonship of Antigenes) that has been interpolated into Xenophon's account (*Hellenika* 1. 3. 1), whether that is the date Xenophon in fact assigned or not. For a more detailed discussion see my note on this fragment in *Androtion* (165–6).

THE BATTLE OF ARGINOUSAI

407/6 Archonship of Antigenes

169. Hellanikos F25 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Frogs* 694 ('And they became Plataians overnight and masters instead of slaves'):

Hellanikos, in describing the events in the archonship of Antigenes, the <predecessor of> Kallias, says that the slaves who joined in fighting the naval engagement (i.e. at Arginousai) were given their freedom and were enrolled as citizens with the same rights as the Plataians.

Commentary

Hellanikos provides the only explicit statement by a historian (rather than a scholiast) of the liberation and enfranchisement of the slaves who fought at Arginousai, but it is clearly implied by Aristophanes. Further, that slaves were used to man the fleet is stated by Xenophon (*Hellenika*: 1.6.24). That citizenship was used as an inducement to non-Athenians is stated by Diodoros (13.97.1), though he does not mention slaves. Their combined testimonies favour Hellanikos. There is still room for disagreement whether the slaves were liberated and/or enrolled as citizens before the battle or after. Hellanikos dated the grant to the archonship of Antigenes, which means that, unless he was mistaken about the date of the battle, he believed the process took place before the battle (Jacoby, *Text*: 54–5). But, I think it most unlikely that there was time to complete the elaborate procedure necessary, i.e. distribution and registration in tribes and demes and maybe in a phratry (for the process see Osborne 1983), in the emergency situation. Even group manumission required some time (Lewis 1959:208–38). It is more likely that it was just the offer that was made. What it meant that they were equated with Plataians is disputed, but the best discussion of that is by Osborne (1982:11–16). For the slight possibility that they were liberated but not enfranchised until later and were amongst those listed in *IG*, II²: 10, see Harding (1987b: 176–82). For a possible connection between the policy of liberating slaves for rowing in the fleet and the Trial of the Generals (below) see Hunt (2001:359–80).

THE ATHENIANS MINT COINS FROM THE GOLDEN NIKAI

407/6 Archonship of Antigenes

170. Hellanikos F26/Philokhoros F141 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Frogs* 720 ('...in regard to the old currency and the recent gold'): **In the previous year in the archonship of Antigenes Hellanikos says they minted the golden currency. And Philokhoros likewise (mentions) the (currency minted) from the golden Nikai.**

Commentary

Compare with Fornara: no. 164. The melting of the golden Nikai (there were eight that had been created between 434 and 406), whether to pay for the building of triremes (Kagan 1987:338) or for the crews (Jacoby, *Text*: 54), is another piece of information that we owe to the Atthidographers, though the existence of the Nikai is well supported by the epigraphic evidence of the fifth century (see Fornara: no. 119 n. 4) and their disappearance is evident from the fourth-century inventories of the Treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods. Only one of the eight survived this emergency (see *IG*, II²: 1388 for 398/7; *Documents*: no. 10, lines 16–24). Their replacement was begun in 377 and carried further by Lykourgos in the 330s. They were melted down again by Lakhares at the end of the fourth century. In this fragment also we find Philokhoros probably deriving his material from his predecessor.

TRIAL OF THE GENERALS FROM
ARGINOUSAI

406/5 (Archonship of Kallias)

171. Philokhoros F142 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1196 ('Then he was blessed indeed, if he was one of the generals with Erasinides'): (Erasinides) was one of those who had the misfortune of being in command at Arginousai. **He was executed publicly together with the others who stayed in Athens (to stand trial), namely Thrasyllus, Perikles, Lysias, Aristokrates, Diomedon, as Philokhoros says.** But Demetrios says that something more extraordinary happened to Erasinides, namely to have been accused of theft of the funds for the Hellespont.

Commentary

The trial of six of the eight generals (two did not return to Athens to stand trial) who had won the battle off the Arginousai islands in 406/5 was one of the most notorious events in Athenian history. It is frequently alluded to and the illegal procedure by which they were tried even prompted an act of protest (useless, as it turned out) by the philosopher Sokrates (Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 1.7.15), but is recounted in full by only two historians, Xenophon (*Hellenika*: 1.6.33–7.35) and Diodoros (13.100–103.2). The two accounts are fundamentally different, largely because of the contradictory approach they take to the involvement of Theramenes, one of the most controversial politicians of his time (Aristotle, *Athēnaion Politeia*: 28, 32–7; Harding 1974:101–11). The trial itself, the action (or lack of action) that prompted it and the machinations that preceded it at Athens have been fought over repeatedly (for an overview see Kagan 1987:354–75; more specifically, Andrewes 1974:112–22; Lavelle 1988:19–41). Typically, the Atthidographer provides only ‘hard’ facts, the names of the generals who were tried and put to death. These details are confirmed (e.g. by Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 1.7.2).

Certainly the factual reporting for which Philokhoros is cited provides no support for the hypothetical assignment to Androtion of a positive evaluation of the career of Theramenes, which supposedly became the basis of Aristotle’s very favourable interpretation in the *Athēnaion Politeia*. This theory, which has played such an important role in Jacoby’s understanding of the supposed political bias of Androtion and, thence, of the whole idea of the ‘political conception’ of the *Atthis*, is not founded upon any evidence (see Harding 1974:101–11; *Androtion*: 14–17; for the suggestion that Aristotle’s source was the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* see Pesely 1994).

THE END OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR TO THE PEACE OF PHILOKRATES

404/3–346/5

From this point onward the only fragments that can be dated or can be reliably assigned to a context come from the works of Androtion and Philokhoros. Each was writing contemporary history about his own time. Sufficient parallels between the two suggest strongly that Philokhoros depended heavily upon Androtion for his account of the fourth century down to 344/3, which is the latest secure date for an entry in Androtion's *Atthis* (F53).

The period of oligarchy

404/3 (Archonship of Pythodoros/*anarkhia*)

172. Androtion F11 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Molpis: Lysias in the (speech) *On the <Estate> of Diogenes* says, ‘Molpis, one of <the Ten> in Peiraieus’. **Indeed, there were ten men in power in Peiraieus at the time of the Thirty. One of them was Molpis, as Androtion (says) in (book) three of Atthis.**

173. Philokhoros F143 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Ploutos* 1146 (‘If you took Phyle, don’t bear a grudge’): That after the return, when Thrasyboulos and his companions had taken Phyle and defeated the Thirty in the Peiraieus, it was resolved that the citizens not bear grudges at all for anything towards each other. But those things had not yet taken place, nor had the events under the administration of the Thirty happened, but **as Philokhoros says, in the fifth year later, after Thrasyboulos’ <victory> had been won, Kritias dies in Peiraieus.** So, it is likely that someone transferred this from the second *Ploutos* and ignored the illogicality or that even the poet himself inserted it later.

174. Androtion F10 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Dekai dekadoukhos (Ten and Tenpartner): Isokrates in the counter-suit *Against Kallimakhos* (18.5) (writes), ‘for the Ten were in power, the ones who took office after the Thirty’. **Concerning the Ten men who were elected at Athens after the dismissal of the Thirty and the things after that Androtion has made mention in the (book) three.** However, each one of these magistrates was called a Tenpartner, as Lysias makes clear in the (speech) *On the Estate of Diogenes*.

Commentary

#172: The Ten men in control of the Peiraieus were set up by the Thirty (Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 35.1). We know of one other member of the group, Kharmides, son of Glaukon, who died with Kritias fighting in the Peiraieus (Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 2.4.19), but only Androtion records the existence of Molpis, who is otherwise totally unknown. See further in *Androtion* (108).

#173: We are not concerned here with the main focus of the scholion, namely the respective dates for the first or second *Ploutos*. The scholiast was clearly working under the illusion that he was dating the first play of that name by Aristophanes, which was staged in the Spring of 408/7. Thus, he was using the death of Kritias in the battle of Munykhia of Spring 403 ('in the fifth year later') as a reference point. Why he should have chosen that event rather than the capture of Phyle or the restoration of the democracy is not clear (Jacoby, *Text*: 512). The battle of Munykhia is described by Xenophon (*Hellenika*: 2.4.10–22), Diodoros (14.33.2–4), Justin (*Epitoma*: 5.9.14–10.3), Nepos (*Thrasyboulos*: 2.5–7) and Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*: 38.1). It was an important victory for the democratic side led by Thrasyboulos. Over seventy of the oligarchs died, including Kritias (*APF*: no. 8792) and Hippomakhos from the Thirty and Kharmides from the Ten in the Peiraieus (Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 2.4.19). See Krentz (1982:89–92).

#174: After their defeat in the battle of Munykhia and the death of Kritias, the Thirty were deposed. This brief résumé from Androtion's account of the deposition of the Thirty and their replacement with a more exclusive body of ten men (cf. Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 38.1; Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 2.4.23–4; Diodoros: 14.33.5; Justin, *Epitoma*: 5.10.4; Lysias: 12.54–5) does not unfortunately tell us why he said they were deposed nor what he thought the Ten were established to do. The latter is particularly disappointing, because our two main accounts, Aristotle and Xenophon, differ radically on their function and Androtion's opinion would have been most helpful. For further discussion of this and the differing interpretations of the expression 'and the things after that' see *Androtion* (106–7).

Capture of Athenian ambassadors by Sparta

398/7 (Archonship of Euthykles) or 397/6 (Archonship of Souniades)

175. Androtion F18/Philokhoros F147 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Hagnias: Isaios (mentions him) in the (speech) *Against Eukleides, concerning the plot of land*. **Androtion in (book) five of his *Atthis*, and Philokhoros, says that this man (Hagnias) and his fellow ambassadors were captured and put to death by the Lakedaimonians.**

Commentary

The book number assigned to this passage does not fit what we know of Androtion's work, since his third book covered the period down to the end of the fifth century. The number should be 'four', but the corruption would be hard to explain palaeographically. It may well be that Harpokration was confused and actually gave the number of Philokhoros' book, which would be correct. This event, which is consistent with other Athenian activities at the time, is also recounted by the author of the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* (7.1; cf. *Documents*: no. 11). For further discussion see my note (*Androtion*: 112–13).

Konon's campaigns

397/6 Archonship of Souniades to 394/3 **(Archonship of Euboulides)**

176. Philokhoros FF144–5 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 7.28–51: Therefore, it has been seen that it is not likely that [D]emosthenes was reminding them of this (30) peace (i.e. the peace negotiations of 392/1), but of some other benefaction and [perhaps of the one] involving Ko[non], the [son of] Timothe[os, on account of the fact that] it was by using *the* armaments provided by Phar[naba]zos that *this man overwhelmed* the [La]kedaimonians in *the* naval engagement near Kn[i]dos. (35) Phi[lokhoro]s *will confirm these events* as well, for *after the heading* ‘the archon (was) [S]ou[niade]s of Akharna[i]’, *he writes* [as follows in his fifth book]: ‘**K[onon having sailed from Ky]pros with [many ships...Pharnabazos, the] satrap of [Phr]ygia...the fleet...(40) he sailed...of 40 triremes...of [the] gulf...[he] brought up/approached [from Sy]ria... (45) (F145) But/ and, after bringing the ships [provided by] the king [near L]orym[a on the] Kher[so]nese and thence...attacking...the navarch of the [L]akedai[monia]ns, who had been carried down [to] /put in at Physkos, and, when a sea battle took place (i.e. the battle of Knidos of 394/3), he (i.e. Konon) was victorious and he took (50) fifty triremes captive and Peisandros was killed.’**

Commentary

For the text and interpretation of this difficult passage that recounts the movements of Konon and Peisandros before the battle of Knidos in 394, see my new edition of the Didymos papyrus (*Didymos*: 66–7, 177–82).

Death of Dorieus, the athlete

c.395/4 (Archonship of Diophantos)

177. Androtion F46 = Pausanias 6.7.4–7: This man (sc. Dorieus) and Peisirodos were proclaimed (at the Olympic games) as Thourians, since they had been driven out of Rhodes by their political opponents and had gone off to live with the Thourians in Italy. Some time later Dorieus returned to Rhodes from exile. Here was one man who was most manifestly of one mind with the Lakedaimonians, to the point that he even fought on sea against the Athenians with his own ships, until he was captured by Attic triremes and carried back alive to Athens. Before Dorieus was brought back to Athens, the Athenians adopted an angry and threatening attitude towards him, but when they had gathered together at an assembly-meeting and saw such a huge man of such great repute cast in the role of a captive, their attitude towards him changed and they let him go free, doing nothing ungracious to him, even though it was in their power to do many (ungracious acts) quite justly. **The details regarding the death of Dorieus are related in the history, called the *Atthis*, by Androtion. (He says that) at that time the Great King's fleet was at Kaunos, with Konon as general in charge of it, and the people of Rhodes had been persuaded by Konon to change their alliance from the Lakedaimonians to the Great King and the Athenians. Dorieus at that time was away from Rhodes travelling in the interior of the Peloponnese. He was arrested by some Lakedaimonians and taken off to Sparta, where he was found guilty of wrongdoing by the Lakedaimonians and condemned to death.** If the account Androtion gives is true, it seems to me that he wants to set the Lakedaimonians on the same level as the Athenians, since the charge of hasty judgement is held also against the Athenians in the case of Thrasylllos and his fellow generals at Arginousai.

Commentary

For full discussion of this important fragment about the demise of Dorieus, son of Damagetos (king of Ialysos on Rhodes), who was one of the most famous athletes of his day as well as being a Rhodian nationalist, see my commentary (*Androtion*: 166–8).

Alliance between Athens and Boiotia

395 (*Archonship of Diophantos*)

178. Philokhoros F148 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Ekklesiazousai* 193–6 (‘Again, what about this treaty? When we were contemplating it,/ people were saying that the city would be destroyed if it did not come to pass./ But when it came about, they turned against it, and the orator/ who talked them into it disappeared in a cloud of smoke’): **Regarding the treaty Philokhoros records that an alliance of the Athenians and the Boiotians was made two years before.**

Commentary

If we accept that the production of the *Ekklesiazousai* took place in Spring 393, the treaty referred to by Philokhoros belongs in 395 (though admittedly the date of the treaty is one of the criteria for dating the play). There is, of course, no reason to believe that the Atthidographer was responsible for the calculation of the interval of two years. That was not a characteristic of the chronicle. It is most likely that Philokhoros' reference is to an alliance between the Athenians and the Boiotian League, headed by Thebes, prior to the beginning of the Corinthian war, which is confirmed by an inscription, *IG II²: 14* (*Documents* no. 14; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 6). Praxagora, however, appears to be talking about the larger alliance of Athens, Argos, Corinth and the Boiotian League that followed (cf. Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 3. 5.7–16; *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*: 7; Diodoros: 14.81.1–3).

Battle of Nemea

395/4 (Archonship of Diophantos)

179. Androtion F47 = Scholion to Demosthenes, *Against Leptines* 52 ('But when the great battle against the Lakedaimonians took place at Korinth...'): Hypereides has spoken about this battle in his (speech) *Against Diondas*. **Both in Ephoros (FGrHist: 70 F209) and Androtion it is recorded that the Spartans won a crushing victory over the Athenians.**

Commentary

The battle of the Nemea River (as it is now called) took place before the middle of July, 394, in the archonship of Diophantos, about one month before the battle of Koroneia. It was fought by the coalition of Argos, Athens, Thebes and Corinth against Sparta. The battle (for which see Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 4.2.9–23) involved about 46,000 hoplites, more than had been used in any battle between city states previously. It resulted in a victory for the Spartans, which secured their control of the Peloponnese, and a major defeat for the allies, who are said to have suffered 2,800 casualties (Diodoros: 14.83.2). The worst losses were suffered by the Athenians, who were on the left wing opposed to the Spartans (Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 4.2.18, 4.2.21). See further in *Androtion* (168–9).

Rebuilding the walls of Athens

395/4 (Archonship of Diophantos)

180a. Philokhoros F40a = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Hermes by the gate: Demosthenes (mentions this) in the (speech) *Against Evergos* (47.26). **Philokhoros in the fifth (book)** says, ‘**when the Athenians were starting to fortify the Peiraeus, the nine archons dedicated this (sc. the Hermes) with the (following) epigram inscribed on it:**

This dedication was made by those who began the fortification, In obedience to the resolutions of the Boule and the People.’

180b. Philokhoros F40b = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Hermes by the gate: **Philokhoros in the fifth (book) of *Atthis* says that the nine archons dedicated a Hermes for the tribes (?) beside the city gate.**

181. Philokhoros F146 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 7.51–54: **Following this naval victory (i.e. the battle of Knidos) Konon also restored the [Long] Walls for the Athenian[s], *against the wishes* of the Lakedaimonians, just as is recorded by the same historian (sc. Philokhoros) once again.**

Commentary

The rebuilding of the walls of the Peiraieus and the Long Walls between Athens and its port city was an important step in her recovery of independence from Sparta and re-assertion of her naval supremacy in the Aegean. Konon's responsibility for the major part of the work (with funds provided by Pharnabazos) is recorded by both Xenophon (*Hellenika*: 4.8.9–10) and Diodoros (14.85.2–3), as well as by Philokhoros in this extract from Didymos' commentary on Demosthenes' *Philippics*. As Xenophon (4.8.10) correctly observed, however, the Athenians themselves had already rebuilt parts of the walls with help from Boiotia and other states, and this fact is confirmed by the epigraphic evidence for the fortifications (*IG*, II²: 1656–64, especially *IG*, II²: 1656, which shows that the rebuilding started in 395/4 before the battle of Knidos; see *Documents*: no. 17; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 9). Philokhoros is probably recording this activity by the Athenian administration in the two citations from Harpokration. His quotation of the epigram inscribed on the Hermes should dismiss any doubts about the use of documentary evidence by the Attidographers, whether he quoted this from his own research or took it from Androtion. The corrupt phrase 'for the tribes' in F40b makes no sense, but probably conceals a reference to the tribal boards of wall-builders (*teikhopoioi*), who appear on the inscriptions (Rhodes and Osborne 2003:47). In that case maybe an appropriate emendation would be something along the lines suggested by Jacoby ('with the tribes', *Notes*: 232 n. 7, and see his discussion in *Text*: 325). For description of the walls with plans and photographs see Travlos (1971:158–79).

Athenian mercenary force at Korinth

393–391

182. Androtion F48/Philokhoros F150 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Mercenary force at Korinth: Demosthenes in *Philippics* (4.24) and Aristophanes in *Ploutos* (173). **Konon first established this (force), Iphikrates and Khabrias later took it over. And by using this (force) they (sc. the Athenians) cut to pieces the *mora* of the Lakedaimonians, under the generalship of Iphikrates and Kallias, as both Androtion and Philokhoros report.**

Commentary

This force of about 1,500 light-armed, mercenary troops (peltasts) may well have been set up by Konon with Pharnabazos' money in 393, but we do not hear of him commanding it. Iphikrates was the most well known Athenian commander of mercenaries from this period. The best known exploit of this force was the one recorded here, when in 390 it destroyed a company of Spartan hoplites (cf. Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 4.5.11–18). For other sources that refer to this force see Harding (*Documents*: no. 22) and for further discussion of this fragment and the careers of the famous Athenian generals, Iphikrates and Khabrias, see *Androton* (169–71).

Peace negotiations of 392/1

392/1 Archonship of Philokles of Anaphlystos

183a. Philokhoros F149a = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 7.11–28 (commenting on Demosthenes speech 10.34): [By the] *previous* restoration some say *he* means the peace that came down in the time of Antialk[idas, the L]ak[onian], *incorrectly*, [at least as it] *seems* to me. For, (15) not *only* [did] the Ath[e]n[ians not accept] that peace, but entirely *the opposite*, they also rejected [what was being offered] to them, for [the reason which **Philo]khoros recounts in these very words, after the heading ‘the archon (was) Philo[kle]s of Anaphly[s]tos’**: ‘And the King sent down the peace (20) in the time of Ant[a]lkidas, which was *not* accepted by the Athenians, because there had been written in it that the Greeks who were inhabiting [As]ia were all (to be) accounted members in the King’s household. Furthermore, they banished the *ambassadors*, who gave their consent in Lakedaimon, (25) on the motion of Kallistratos; and Epikrates of Kephisia, Andokides of Kydathenaion, Kratinos of Sphettos, and Euboulides of Eleusis did *not even* await the judgement/trial.’

183b. Philokhoros F149b = Argument to Andokides speech 3, *On the Peace*: Since the Hellenic war was dragging on for a long time and the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians along with their respective allies were enduring many hardships, the Athenians sent ambassadors with full authority to negotiate to Lakedaimon. One of these was Andokides. After some proposals were made by the Lakedaimonians and they had sent their own ambassadors, a resolution was made that the People would hold secret deliberations about the peace within forty days. And under these conditions Andokides advises the Athenians to accept the peace... **Well, Philokhoros says that the ambassadors both came from Lakedaimon and returned home without accomplishing anything, since Andokides failed to persuade.**

Commentary

The fragmentary papyrus that contains part of the commentary of the Alexandrian scholar, Didymos, on Demosthenes' *Philippics* provides us with some of the most extensive verbatim quotations from the Atthidographers, especially from Philokhoros, whom he used as his main source for historical matters related to Athens. I have recently re-edited this papyrus and there discussed in detail this passage on the abortive peace negotiations of 392/1 and their relationship to the career of Andokides, the orator (*Didymos*: 66 [text], 165–77 [commentary]).

Capture of the Theban Kadmeia by Phoibidas

382/1 (Archonship of Evandros)

184. Androtion F50 = Scholion to Aelius Aristeides, *Panathenaikos* 172 ('... and they (sc. the Athenians) displayed not (just) one form of benefaction, but omitted none, receiving them in their flight and collaborating with them in their return ...'): **The fugitives were four hundred, as Androtion says.**

Commentary

In 382/1 the Spartan commander, Phoibidas, who was on his way through Boiotia to Olynthos, sidestepped to Thebes, where he seized and garrisoned the acropolis (the Kadmeia) in an unprovoked act of hostility which created an international incident (cf. Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 5.3.25–31; Diodoros: 15.20.2; Plutarch, *Pelopidas*: 5.2–3). At that time many Thebans fled to Athens, where they were hospitably received in return for the protection given by the Thebans to Thrasyboulos and the other democratic exiles during the rule of the Thirty at Athens. Xenophon and Diodoros give the number of refugees as 300, while Androtion gives a larger figure. It is impossible to tell who is correct, though most accept the lower number. See further in *Androtion* (173–4).

Reorganization of the taxation system at Athens

378/7 Archonship of Nausinikos

185. Philokhoros F41 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. *symmory*: Demosthenes (mentions this) in *Against Aphobos* I (27.7). It was not the whole population, as it is amongst us, that was divided into the *symmories* (tax-paying groups) at Athens, but only the rich and the men who were capable of paying the capital-levy (*eisphora*) to the city... **And the Athenians were divided for the first time by *symmories* in the archonship of Nausinikos, as Philokhoros says in the fifth (book) of *Atthis*.**

186. Philokhoros F45 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. One thousand two hundred: Isaios (mentions this) in the (speech) *Against Iskhomakhos*... **The very wealthy amongst the Athenians were twelve hundred (in number), and these were also the men who performed liturgies. There is mention of them by the orators and by Philokhoros in the sixth (book).**

187. Philokhoros F46 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. 'That six thousand talents was the rateable value of Attika': Demosthenes in the (speech) *On the Symmories* (14. 30) says the following: 'He will hear that we have as a resource (for war) the value of our territory, (which is) eight thousand talents.' Either this is a scribal error or perhaps the orator is carrying (us) away, so that it may seem that the city's resource for the war against the King is greater (i.e. than it is). **For, that the rateable value of Attika was six thousand talents is stated...and by Philokhoros in the tenth (book) of *Atthis*.**

Commentary

I have grouped these three fragments together, despite the difference in book numbers. At least one of those, 'tenth' in F46, is quite incredible. Furthermore, we have a passage from Polybios (2.62.7), which gives a similar (though strangely more precise) figure for the rateable value of Attika in a context that is usually taken to belong to 378/7. Indeed, that the whole system of taxation (the capital-levy or *eisphora*) and performance of liturgies (especially, the trierarchy) was reformed at the time of the Second Confederacy, when the naval records begin, is likely and is my justification for putting these fragments in one group (cf. *Documents*: no. 39, with bibliography). But the whole subject is quite controversial and many different interpretations exist. For a recent discussion of the trierarchic symmories, the law of Periandros of 358/7 and the reforms of Demosthenes of 354/3 and/or 340 see Gabrielsen (1994:173–217) and for the taxation-system as a whole see Thomsen (1964: especially 24–37, 45–104, 194–249).

The peace of $375/4$

375/4 (Archonship of Hippodamas)

188. Philokhoros F151 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 7.62–71:
But Demosthenes could in this instance (10.34) be making mention of another peace initiated by the King, one which the Athenians were glad to agree to. **Philokhoros has discoursed about this peace also, (saying) that they agreed to it, (though it was) very similar to that of the Lakonian, Antalkidas, because they were exhausted by the cost of maintaining mercenary troops and were worn out from the war (being) very long. At this time, too, they set up the altar of Eirene.**

Commentary

In 378/7 warfare resumed between the Spartans and the Athenians and their allies, but by 375/4 everyone was exhausted and funds were running short. On the intervention of Artaxerxes, the king of Persia, who was in need of Greek hoplites for his invasion of Egypt, peace was concluded on much the same terms as in the Great King's peace of 387/6, with the exception that the existence of Athens' Second League (for which see Cargill 1981) was recognized (Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 6.2.1; Diodoros: 15.38; Isokrates, 15 *Antidosis*: 109; Nepos, *Timotheus*: 2.2; cf. *Documents*: no. 44). The establishment of the cult of Peace (Eirene) and the creation of the famous statue of that goddess (holding the child Wealth in her arms) by the great Athenian sculptor, Kephisodotos, father of Praxiteles, is best suited to this context, though there are those who argue that the peace of 371, or even that of 362/1, better suit the art historical evidence. For further discussion with bibliography see *Didymos* (183–4).

The Arkadian league

post 370/69

189. Androtion F51 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Eparitai:
A tribe in Arkadia. Their city ought to be Eparis, but it is not found.
**Xenophon (*Hellenika*: 6.4) and Ephoros (*FGrHist*: 70 F215) and
Androtion speak about this tribe.**

Commentary

Stephanos is in error, there is no such tribe. He is probably referring to the 'Eparitai', the 'select' or 'chosen' ones, who composed the standing army of the Arkadian League (cf. Xenophon, *Hellenika*: 7.4.22, 33, 36; 7.5.3; Diodoros: 15.62.2, 67.2, who calls them 'epilektoi'), which came into existence after the battle of Leuktra. See further in *Androtion* (174).

Androtion creates new ceremonial equipment

post 368/7

190. Philokhoros F181 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Processions and processing: *Pompeia* is the term for the equipment used for putting on the ceremonial processions, as the same author (sc. Demosthenes) indicates in *Against Androtion* (22.48). **Philokhoros says ‘Previously the Athenians used processional equipment (*pompeia*) that had been made from (the proceeds of) the property of the Thirty, but lately,’ he says, ‘Androtion made other equipment.’**

Commentary

Jacoby (*Text*: 550–1) treats this fragment as part of Philokhoros' entry on the Thirty and considers the reference to Androtion's activity anticipatory. I find this awkward. It is easier to see the mention of the Thirty as a backward reference. In any case, sometime after 368/7 (Lewis 1954:45) Androtion was involved in melting down golden crowns (dedicated by the recipients) from the sacred treasuries for the creation of new *pompeia* (cf. Demosthenes: 22.69–77; 24.176–86), and this is no doubt what is being referred to here. Whether that has anything to do with the inscription (*IG*, II²: 216–17; *IG*, II²: 261) that is currently dated to 365/4 (Lewis 1954:39–49) and records the fact that Androtion introduced a motion regarding the handing over (*paradosis*) of processional vessels from one board of *tamiai* to another is unclear, though most believe that the two activities are connected. For discussion see *Androtion*: 19–20 and page 54 for a translation of the inscription, which is T5 in Jacoby.

Affairs in Thrace

362/1–360/59 (Archonships of Molon, Nikophemos and Kallimedes)

191. Philokhoros F42 = *Lexikon* on Demosthenes 23 (*Against Aristokrates*), 104 (*P.Berol.*5008 A 1): **That [Miltokythes] revolted from [Koty]s has been revealed by Philokhoros in the fifth (book) of the A[*tthis*].**

192. Philokhoros F43 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Stryme: Demosthenes (refers to this) in the (speech) *On the cost of a trierarchy* (50) 20–3. Herakleides or Philostephanos says in *On Islands*: ‘Galepsos and the island of Stryme are colonies of Thasos on the coast of Thrace.’ It (Stryme) is a trading post of the Thasians. **Mention of the dispute over Stryme between the Thasians and the people of Maroneia is made by Philokhoros in (book) five, who cites the testimony of Arkhilokhos.** Cf. Androtion F31 (#260 in [Appendix 1](#)).

193. Philokhoros F44 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Datos: It is a very prosperous city in Thrace. From it is derived also a proverb, ‘Datos of good things.’ Those who have given information about it and its surrounding territory have sometimes used the neuter form of its name, sometimes the feminine, as Ephoros does in the fourth (book) (*FGrHist*: 70 F37); only once is it found in the masculine, in the third (book) of Theopompos’ *Philippika* (*FGrHist*: 115 F43). **The city changed its name from (the city) of the Datenes to <Philippoi>, after Philip, king of the Makedonians, captured it, as Ephoros says, and Philokhoros in the fifth (book).**

194. Androtion F19 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Kephisodotos: Aiskhines in the (speech) *Against Ktesiphon* (3.51) (mentions him). **Androtion in (book) five of *Atthis* records that, as (Kephisodotos) was besieging Alopekonnesos, he was voted out of office and, after a trial, was found guilty and fined five talents.**

Commentary

Jacoby (*Text*: 325–7) associates the three fragments from Philokhoros with the activities of the Athenians in the northern Aegean, which began in 368/7 under the leadership of Iphikrates and continued from 366/5 under Timotheos, whose greatest but quite ephemeral successes were the capture of Methone, Pydna, Torone and Poteidaia, to the last of which the Athenians sent out a Kleroukhy in 361/0 (*IG*, II²: 114; *Documents*: no. 58). He is surely correct. The fragment from Androtion (on which see *Androtion*: 114–17), regarding the trial of Kephisodotos in 360/59 (the archonship of Kallimedes according to the scholion to Aiskhines: 3.51), belongs to the same activities. The Athenians were mainly concerned to keep or gain control of places in the Thracian Khersonese and on the coast of Thrace, especially Amphipolis. They were resisted by the Amphipolitans and alternately aided and opposed by the wily Thracian king, Kotys I, from whom Miltokythes revolted in 362.

The most important ancient source for this period is Demosthenes' speech 23, *Against Aristokrates*, especially his review of Kharidemos' disservices to Athens (23.104ff.). The fragment of a lexicon to #104 of this speech (*P.Berol.*5008) continues with a quotation from Theopompos (*FGrHist*: 115 F307), describing the death of Miltokythes at the hands of Kersebleptes (for a translation see Shrimpton 1991:258). Another speech from the Demosthenic corpus, [Demosthenes] speech 50, *Against Polykles*: 20–3, refers to Athenian involvement in the conflict between Thasos and Maroneia over Stryme, which must be the context of F43. In that fragment the mention of Philokhoros' use of the archaic poet, Arkhilokhos, not only demonstrates the breadth of material employed by the Attidographers, but has also led to the suggestion that Philokhoros' name should be restored in the text of *IG*, XII: 5, no. 445, line 12, the Arkhilokhos monument of Paros (*FGrHist*: 502 F1). Regarding Daton, the city of the Datenes in F44, Diodoros (16.3.7) records its foundation by the Thasians in 360/59 under its more common name, Krenides, and its re-foundation by Philip II of Macedon as Philippi in 358/7 (16.8.6). Finally, the activities of the *strategos*, Kephisodotos, in the Hellespont and his prosecution, probably by *eisangelia*, are referred to by Aiskhines (3.51) and Demosthenes (23.163, 166–7). A good modern account of this period can be found in Sealey (1993:88–91). Cf. Cawkwell (1978:69–76) and, for Kotys, Hammond (Hammond

and Griffith 1979:195–6).

The Social War, 357/6–355/4

***(Archonships of Agathokles, Elpines and
Kallistratos)***

195. Androtion F22 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Arkesine: One of the three cities on the island of Amorgos. For they were Melania, Minoa, Arkesine. But Polybios uses the name with the masculine article. The ethnic (is) Arkesinean. **Androtion (in book) six of *Atthis*** (writes), ‘**to/for Amorgians, Minoitans and Arkesineans**’.

Commentary

Androtion was governor of Arkesine on the island of Amorgos for two years, most probably between 358/7 and 357/6. He received respectful honours from the citizens for his performance (*IG*, XII: 7 no. 5; *Androtion*: 20, 55). One of his benefactions was the ransoming of some citizens who had been captured, probably from an action in the so-called Social War. That war was the most likely context for him to have referred to this island and its communities. See further in *Androtion* (118–19).

Trial of Timotheos, son of Konon

354/3 Archonship of Diotimos

196. Philokhoros F152 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Deinarkhos* 13: *On the Exchange of Property <against> Megakleides* ('If it was necessary, gentlemen, against three or four...'). The speaker is Aphareus, and it is not one of Deinarkhos' speeches. For it was spoken whilst the general, Timotheos, was still alive, during the time of his generalship with Menestheus. When he (sc. Timotheos) underwent his scrutiny for this generalship, he was found guilty. Timotheos underwent his scrutiny in the archonship of Diotimos (354/3), who followed Kallistratos, at the time when **

Commentary

This fragment and the one following are included by Jacoby (*Text*: 526) amongst the fragments of Philokhoros, even though they do not explicitly mention his name, on the very good grounds that Dionysios, like his contemporary Didymos, regularly used that Atthidographer for archon-dated material on Athenian history. The reference is to the battle of Embata (356/5), near Erythrai, in which the Athenian generals (Iphikrates, Timotheos, Menestheus and Khares) suffered defeat at the hands of a coalition of defecting allies led by the Khians, Rhodians and Byzantines, which defeat brought about the end of the Social War (Diodoros: 16.21.1–4; Nepos, *Timotheus*: 3.4–5; Polyainos, *Strategemata*: 3.9.29; Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Embaton). Khares laid the blame upon the other generals, who were brought to trial. Iphikrates and his son, Menestheus (Timotheos' son-in-law), were acquitted (probably in 356/5), but Timotheos was found guilty in a separate trial in 354/3 (if the information in this fragment is correct) and fined a great sum of money (Isokrates, *Antidosis*: 129; Nepos, *Timotheus*: 3.5; Diodoros: 16.21.4), perhaps as much as 100 talents (Deinarkhos: 1.14). He went into exile on Euboia, where he soon died. For a recent review of the facts with bibliography see Worthington (1992:148–56).

Athens opposes Philip of Macedon at Thermopylai

353/2 Archonship of Thoudemos

197. Philokhoros F153 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Deinarkhos* 13: *Against Boiotos over the name* ('No meddlesomeness...'). If those people who try to remove this speech from Demosthenes and ascribe it to Deinarkhos would not be refuted by other arguments, they would be shown to be in error by the date. For there is mention of the marching out to the Gates as having recently taken place. The Athenian expedition took place in the archonship of Thoudemos (353/2), in Deinarkhos' eleventh year.

Commentary

In 353/2 Philip II of Macedon defeated Onomarkhos, the mercenary commander of the Phokian forces, in a battle that took place in a field of crocuses (now often called the battle of Crocus Field) somewhere along the coast of Magnesia (Diodoros: 16.35.5–7). Following that, he made a move toward Thermopylai, the entrance to central Greece. We do not know precisely what he intended, but in the event he was prevented from passing through by the Phokian force under Phayllos, who had help from his allies. Of those, Athens was the most prompt to act and sent the strongest assistance, 5000 hoplites and 400 cavalry under the general Nausikles (Diodoros: 16.37.3, who puts the action in 352/1; Demosthenes, *On the Crown*: 32; *On the False Embassy*: 84; Justin, *Epitoma*: 8.2.8–12). From this fragment we learn that the Atthidographers dated the action to 353/2. For modern comment see Cawkwell (1978:66–8), Griffith (Hammond and Griffith 1979:279–81) and Sealey (1993:122).

Philip seizes an Athenian sacred Trireme

352/1 (Archonship of Aristodemos)

198. Androtion F24/Philokhoros F47 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Sacred Trireme: Demosthenes in (the) *Fourth Philippic* (4.34) (writes) ‘and he (sc. Philip) left our territory with the Sacred Trireme.’ **He could mean the *Paralos*, as one can comprehend from the works of both Philokhoros and Androtion, alike (in the) sixth (book).**

Commentary

In the passage from the *First Philippic* (*Fourth* for Harpokration, since in antiquity the *Olynthiacs* were considered *Philippics*) cited by Harpokration here (4.34) Demosthenes is listing off a series of outrages committed by Philip against Athens, of which the last was his descent upon Marathon where he captured one of the Sacred Triremes. Jacoby (*Text*: 141) denies that the sequence is chronological and wants to date the event to 354/3. He has his supporters, but I prefer the arguments of Griffith (1979:311). For further discussion of this fragment and the Sacred Triremes at Athens see *Androtion*: 120–2.

Athens sends Kleroukhs to Samos

352/1 Archonship of Aristodemos

199. Philokhoros F154 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Deinarkhos* 13: *Countersuit against Pedieus* ('In accordance with this law'). This speech was delivered in the archonship of Aristodemos, as is clear from the speech itself. **For the kleroukhs who were sent out to Samos were dispatched under this archon, as Philokhoros says in the *Histories*.**

Commentary

This reference is to the third group of settlers who were sent out to Samos by Athens. The first went out in 366/5 right after Timotheos captured the island (Diodoros: 18.18.9), and may be mentioned in *IG*, II²: 1609.88–9. The second is attested, with archon date, by a scholion to Aiskhines: 1.53. See *Documents*: no. 77.

Dispute between Athens and Megara over the Sacred Orgas

350/49 Archonship of Apollodoros

200. Philokhoros F155/Androton F30 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 13.40–57, col. 14.35–49. Col. 13.40–57: But one could detect that the date of the speech (i.e. Demosthenes 13) was the archonship of K[a]llimakhos, the (archon) after Apollodoros. Why, do you suppose? Because he mentions the action taken by the Athenians against the Megarians over the Sacred Orgas (13.32). **This (45) happened during the archonship of Apollodoros**, as is recounted by Philokhoros, writing as follows: ‘Because the Athenians had a dispute with the Megarians over the delimitation of the Sacred [O]rgas, they entered (the territory of) Megara *with* (50) Ephialtes, the general for the homeguard, and marked out the limits of the Sacred Orgas. With the Megarians’ agreement the men who marked out the boundaries were Lakrateides the Hierophant and Hierok[l]eides the Dadoukhos. And the edge-lands, too, around the Orgas, (55) were consecrated by them, after the sanctuary (i.e. Delphi) had responded (that) it was more profitable and better (for them), if they left (the edge-lands) untilled and did not farm (them). And they fenced (it/them) around with stelai according to the decree of Philokrates’... col. 14.35–49: And[r]otion, too, has written about this Orgas in the seventh (book) of the *Atthides*. He writes as follows: ‘But the Athenians, too, marked the boundaries of the Orgas in the direction of the Megarians on account of the Two Goddesses (i.e. Demeter and Persephone), in whatever way they (40) wanted. For the Megarians agreed (that) the boundary-markers had been the Hierophant, Lakrateides, and the Daidoukhos, Hierokleides. And they abided by the boundaries as these men had marked (them). And the edge-lands, as many as were besides the (45) Orgas, were consecrated by them, after they had consulted the oracle (i.e. Delphi) and the God (i.e. Apollo) had replied (that) it was more profitable and better for them, if they did not cultivate (them). And the boundary was marked off in a circle with marble stelai, on the motion of Philokrates.’

Commentary

I have discussed these important extracts, concerning the dispute between Athens and Megara over some sacred land (the Sacred Orgas) around the sanctuary of the Two Goddesses at Eleusis in 352–49, several times, most recently in my re-editing of the text of Didymos (see Harding, *Documents*: no. 78: *Androtion*: 125–7; *Didymos* 245–8; cf. Rhodes and Osborne 2003:272–81). They provide the longest examples of the narrative style of the chroniclers and, at the same time, by the way they relate to the documentary evidence (*IG*, II²: 204), give an idea how these historians used documents.

Athenian aid for Olynthos

349/8 Archonship of Kallimakhos of Pergase

201. Philokhoros F49–51 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *To Ammaios* 1.9: So, the philosopher himself (i.e. Aristotle) demonstrates that these works were written by him after the Olynthian War. **(F49) But this war took place in the archonship of Kallimakhos, as Philokhoros makes clear in the sixth book of the *Atthis*, writing as follows: ‘Kallimakhos from Pergase. In this man’s archonship, when the Olynthians were being attacked by Philip and had sent ambassadors to Athens, the Athenians made an alliance with them...(lacuna) they sent two thousand peltasts as assistance, and the thirty triremes (that were) with Khares plus eight that they had manned.’** Then, after recounting a few events that intervened, he states this: **(F50) ‘Around the same time, as the Khalkidians in Thrace were being worn down by the war and had sent an embassy to Athens, the Athenians sent them Kharidemos, the general in the Hellespont. He, with eighteen triremes, four thousand peltasts and one hundred and fifty cavalry, joined the Olynthians in invading Pallene and Bottiaia and laid waste to the land.’** Later, concerning the third (sending of) assistance, he says this: **(F51) ‘Once again the Olynthians sent ambassadors to Athens and were begging them (i.e. the Athenians) not to overlook their (i.e. the Olynthians’) being overcome in war but to send them, in addition to the forces they had already sent, reinforcements that were composed of Athenians rather than mercenaries. The People sent them seventeen more triremes, two thousand citizen-hoplites and three hundred cavalry in horse-transport, with Khares as the general in charge of the whole expedition.’**

Commentary

These three fragments are of primary importance to historians of Philip's war on Olynthos in 349/8, providing invaluable information on the dates and the troops dispatched. The cold factual reporting is representative of the style of the *Atthis* (see *Androtion*: 6–8) and serves as a useful antidote to the rhetorical representation of Demosthenes in his three *Olynthiacs*. See the discussions in Cawkwell (1978:82–90), Griffith (Hammond and Griffith 1979:296–328) and Sealey (1993:137–43).

Philip captures Olynthos

348/7 Archonship of Theophilos

202. Philokhoros F156 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *To Ammaios*

1.10.3: After the archonship of Kallimakhos, in whose time the Athenians sent the relief forces to Olynthos on the persuasion of Demosthenes, followed the archonship of Theophilos. During his time Philip gained control of the city of the Olynthians.

Commentary

Another ghost fragment, since Philokhoros is not named, but the same arguments in support of attributing this information to him apply here as they did for #196 and #197. After the detailed coverage Philokhoros had provided for Athenian assistance to Olynthos during the war, we would expect him to have recorded the unfortunate conclusion.

Lives of the philosophers

348/7 Archonship of Theophilos

203. Philokhoros F59 = Philodemos, *Syntaxis Philosophorum*, Pap. Herc. col. 2.4–38 (ed. Gaiser): **Though [D]ikaiarkhos has written in such terms, Phil[o]khoros in the sixth (book) of *Atth[i]s*, has made the following punning allusion on his (i.e. Plato's) [name]: '[Ever] fabricating (anaplatton) and refining, [you create] everything without understanding, [or even yourself] comprehending.'** And [there is] *this* [concerning] *him* in the *fifth* (book of the *Atthis*?): And they set up as a dedication an *image* of Is[o]krates, and the *base*, on which is *inscribed* '[B]outes of [Phly]a made (the) *image*', is *inscribed* with many names. *Justifiably* [P]l[ato] was asked [if he desired] a *similar* [image, and he said]: 'If god, who has been [honoured] in this way, *strongly* [forbids our] *race* [from aiming for] the same honours, shall I create an evil [through my arrogant behaviour]?' So, [in place of] an *image*, [a majority of his pupils] dedicated to *him* a bronze Protector (i.e. Apollo), [on which] is *inscribed the following*: 'Know [well] that the dedication, [as a defender,] will destroy (apolounta) [harmful things].' And he (Philokhoros?) says further on: *No needy person, in my opinion, [purchases] the M[o]useion, but it was a man from the deme Kollytos.* And he (Philokhoros) says that he (Plato) died in the *archonship* of Theophilos at the age of eighty-two years.

204. Philokhoros F223 = *Vita Aristotelis Marciana* p. 428: So, Aristotle did not set up the Lykeion in opposition to Plato, since he lived with him until his (i.e. Plato's) death. That is a slanderous suggestion that was first spread abroad by Aristoxenos. **The fact is that Plato was born at Athens in the archonship of Diotimos (428/7) and, after living for 82 years, quit this life in the archonship of Theophilos (348/7), whilst Aristotle was born in the archonship of Diotrephes (384/3) and, after living 63 years, died in the archonship of Philokles (322/1). Aristotle began his association with Plato in the archonship of Nausigenes (368/7) and from Theophilos, in whose time Plato died, to Philokles, in whose time Aristotle died, he survived Plato by 23 years. Wherefore, it follows that Aristotle did not begin his association with Plato in the time (acme?) of Eudoxos (the mathematician from Knidos), when he was forty years of age, as the slanderers say. For (if that were the case), since Aristotle lived for 63 years altogether, once the 20 years that he studied with Plato have been subtracted, there**

remain only three years after the death of Plato. But in these three years it was not possible (for him) to produce so much, nor even easy (for him) to read (so much). This is how Philokhoros recorded (the matter), and (he said) that it was not likely that Aristotle, being a foreigner, was able to do this (i.e. set up a rival institution) against Plato, who was a citizen and a man of great influence through his connection with Khabrias and Timotheos, both of whom were generals at Athens and related to him by birth.

205. Philokhoros F224 = Philodemos, *Syntaxis Philosophorum*, *Pap. Herc.* col. 6.28–38: Spe[usippos], therefore, took over the *school* from him (i.e. Plato). [And Speu]sipp[o]s, as Phil[okhoros] says, [dedicated statues of the Graces] *that still exist*, [when he was already] *in control of* the Mousei[on]. On these *is inscribed*, ‘*To the goddess M[ou]ses, Speusipp[os] dedicated the goddess Graces, as gifts for the rites of learning.*’

Commentary

Jacoby treats these fragments separately (*Text*: 334–5, 588–91; *Notes*: 239–40, 482–4). I shall comment on them as a group. First, they demonstrate that Philokhoros, at least, and probably Androtion before him (since he was a student of Isokrates and was of the right social status and age to have known both Plato and Aristotle), chronicled the important dates in the lives of the great philosophers (as they probably did for the dramatists and their plays). The archon dates for the lives of Plato and Aristotle that are attributed to Philokhoros in the *Vita Marciana* are the same as those found in Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *To Ammaios*: 1.5 and Diogenes Laertios: 5.9–10, both of whom, however, add Olympic dates. In the case of Diogenes, we are told explicitly that his dates were taken from the *Khronika* of the second-century chronographer, Apollodoros (*FGrHist*: 244 F38), but the archon dates will have entered the tradition from the *Atthis*.

Second, we can see that Philokhoros permitted himself to enter the fray in the disputes between the Akademy and the Peripatos, defending Aristotle against the charge of being a ‘late-starter’ in F223, and quoting a dismissive observation from Plato against Isokrates in F59. The amount of anecdotal material that Philokhoros cites verbatim may surprise in a chronicle, but some, at least, was taken from documentary dedicatory inscriptions (i.e. on the Isokrates monument in F59 and on Speusippos’ Graces in F224). His knowledge about the relationship of Plato to Timotheos and Khabrias may well derive from their contemporary, Androtion.

Third, with Philodemos we find another distinguished first-century scholar (he wrote many works including erotic epigrams, but his major publication was his *Syntaxis* – a sort of history of philosophy) who used the *Atthis* as a basic source, not only for dates but also for anecdotes. I have already pointed out that both Dionysios of Halikarnassos and Didymos valued Philokhoros as a source of reliable information, and in the two quotations from Philodemos’ *Syntaxis* that have been extracted from the papyrus rolls rescued from the *Villa dei papyri* in Herculaneum, we find a similar attitude. Note that in the first of these (F59) I have used a more recent text than the one printed in Jacoby.

Finally, an indication of how immediate and intense the disputes between these schools were can be found in the different traditions (ranging from Aristotle’s paian to the abusive epigram of Theokritos

of Khios) put out about Hermeias of Atarneus, the man whose daughter/niece? Aristote married, when he took refuge with him at Assos after the death of Plato in 347. The main source for this is Didymos in his commentary *On Demosthenes*, col. 4.59–6.62 (*Didymos*: 56–65, 124–62). Another passage regarding Aristotle's sojourn at Assos has been found by Gaiser (1988:161–2, 380–6) in the Herculaneum papyrus of Philodemos' *Syntaxis*, a passage which he believes was attributed to Philokhoros. If he is right, we would have a new fragment to add to the corpus of Philokhoros. For a translation of that passage, as restored by Gaiser, see *Didymos*: 139–40.

Revision of the citizenship list in Athens

346/5 Archonship of Arkhias

206. Androtion F52/Philokhoros F52 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Diapsephisis: Specifically it (i.e. *diapsephisis*) applies to the scrutinies in the demes, which take place for each of the demesmen, (to find) whether he is, in fact, a citizen and a demesman or whether his name has been illegally inscribed in the list, since he is a foreigner: (so) Aiskhines (in the speech) *Against Timarkhos*. **The most complete description of the revision, how it took place in the archonship of Arkhias, (has been given) by Androtion in his *Atthis* and by Philokhoros in the sixth (book) of his *Atthis*.**

Commentary

Though the original meaning of the words *diapsephisis* or *diapsephismos* was any voting by ballot, they came to acquire the specific connotation of a review of the list of citizens (the *lexiarchika grammateia*) that were kept in the demes. The criteria for inclusion are provided by Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*: 42.1 (with Rhodes, *Commentary*: *ad loc.*). Whilst earlier references to such a review exist (e.g. *Athenaion Politeia*: 13.5 and Philokhoros F119/#131 above), they are questionable. This one, however, is confirmed by other references (Aiskhines: 1.77–8, with scholion; Libanios in the *hypothesis* to Demosthenes 57, *Against Euboulides*; cf. *Documents*: no. 85). This review was, apparently, notorious. See further on the issues in *Androtion* 174–8.

THE PEACE OF PHILOKRATES TO THE ARCHONSHIP OF PHILIPPOS

346/5–292/1

With the exception of one fragment from Androtion (F53), all the entries in this chapter derive from Philokhoros. It is a rather unfortunate indication of the lack of interest on the part of later writers in the history of Athens in the third century that only two fragments possibly dating from that period have been preserved. This was a period which Philokhoros treated in great detail, since he devoted the last eight of his seventeen books to the forty years from 302/1 to 262/1. The loss of those books seriously impairs our ability to write an intelligent history of these crucial years.

Athens rebuffs Artaxerxes' approach

344/3 Archonship of Lykiskos

207. Androtion F53/Philokhoros F157 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 8.7–26: Well now, five years before this, in the archonship of Lykiskos, when Philip sent (an embassy) to Athens concerning peace, the Athenians also gave audience to the ambassadors of the King (i.e. Artaxerxes), but their verbal exchange with them was more arrogant than it should have been. For *they said* (that) they would live at peace with *him*, provided he did not attack the Hellen[ic cities]. *These matters are recounted by Androtion, who also [...Ana]ximenēs. But it would be better to add [the words] of [Phi]lokhoros, for, after the heading ‘the archon (was) Lykiskos’ he goes on: ‘In this man’s archonship, when the King sent ambassadors to Athe[ns] and was asking that his ancestral friendship continue to exist, reply was made [to his] ambassadors at Athens that the King would continue to have [their] friendship, so long as he did not attack [the] Hellenic cities.’* Clearly in these (negotiations) the proposals sent down by the King were peaceful and generous, while the reaction of the People (was) quite the reverse, excessively heavy-handed and abrasive.

Commentary

The archonship of Lykiskos was in 344/3 (AO: 326). The situation described happened at the beginning of the archon year, since it follows the heading. The embassy from Artaxerxes Okhos is confirmed by Diodoros (16.44), though with the wrong date. An embassy from Philip is mentioned by Demosthenes in his *Fourth Philippic* (10.34) in 341/0 and by Philip in his *Letter to the Athenians* ([Dem.]: 12.6) of 340. Whether the two embassies coincided is disputed, as is the significance of the King's request and the responsibility for the negative judgement of the Athenian response. The unpreserved space between 'Androtion, who also' and '[Ana]ximenēs' is often restored to read 'at that time proposed the motion, and'. Jacoby has built a large part of his interpretation of Androtion's political allegiance and subsequent exile upon that restoration, probably without basis. He discusses these important and controversial fragments under Philokhoros F157 (*Text*: 531–3; *Notes*: 426–30). His views are still valuable. I have discussed them more than once (1976:197–8; *Androtion*: 178–80; and, most recently, with new text and bibliography, *Didymos*: 186–91). This is the last datable fragment of Androtion's *Atthis*.

Diopeithes in the Hellespont

343/2 Archonship of Pythodotos

208. Philokhoros F158 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Deinarkhos* 13: For Athenades, a supporting speech, against Amyntikhos, *On the Raft* ('Since he was my friend and acquaintance...'). The second speech ('I think, gentlemen, that you...').

The speech was delivered when Diopeithes, the general of the Athenians, was still hanging around in the region of the Hellespont, as becomes clear from (the speech) itself. **The time is during the archonship of Pythodotos, as Philokhoros shows along with the others...*(Deinarkhos) not yet being twenty years old at the time of this archonship.**

Commentary

According to the *hypothesis* to Demosthenes, *On the Khersonese*, the orator wrote that speech in defence of the activities of Diopeithes, not least for having attacked Kardia in 343/2 for not accepting Athenian kleroukhs, as other cities in the region had done (cf. scholion to Aiskhines: 3.83). Kardia was a key city on the narrow neck of the Khersonese, which had not passed into Athenian hands when Kersebleptes entrusted the rest of the Khersonese to her in 353/2 (Diodoros: 16.34.4), and had been an ally of Philip since before the Peace of Philokrates (*Letter to the Athenians* [Dem.]: 12.11). It became a point of contention between Philip and Athens. For the strategy behind these actions on both sides see Griffith (1979:510–13) and Sealey (1993:179–80).

Athens liberates Oreus and Eretria from tyranny

342/1 Archonship of Sosigenes

209. Philokhoros F159 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 1.13–18:
[...in Philo]khoros testifies. For regarding the aid [that went out]
to [Oreus], after the heading ‘the archon (was) Sos[i]ge[nes]’, [he
says] *this*: ‘And (the) Athenians *made* an alliance with (the)
Khalkidians and in conjunction with (the) Khalkidians liberated
the [O]reitans in the month of [Skiropho]rion; Kephisophon was
the general; and Phi[listid]es the tyrant died.’

341/0 Archonship of Nikomakhos

210. Philokhoros F160 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 1.18–25:
And regarding the (aid that went out) to Eretria [again] *the same man* (i.e. Philokhoros) says as follows, after the heading ‘the archon (was) Nikomakhos’: ‘In *this man’s archonship* [the Ath]enians went across (to Euboia) against Eretria with Phokion as their general and, with the intention of restoring the People, began to besiege Kleitarkhos, (a man) [who] *previously* was a factional rival of Ploutarkhos and *used to conduct politics* in opposition to him, but (who) became tyrant after that man (i.e. Ploutarkhos) had been expelled. On this occasion the Athenians, after overcoming him (i.e. Kleitarkhos) by siege, restored the city to the *People*.’

Commentary

These two fragments are taken from the mutilated first column of the Didymos papyrus. The text is poorly preserved. I am using my own version (*Didymos*: 46), not the one in Jacoby. The passage constitutes Didymos' last comment on the *Third Philippic* (speech 9), though there is little agreement on which section. In his comment Didymos provides valuable citations from Philokhoros regarding Athenian involvement in Euboia at the end of 342/1 (the restoration of the month, Skirophorion, is from a scholion to Aiskhines: 3.85) and the very beginning of 341/0. The campaigns were designed to assist Euboian nationalists in the liberation of Oreus and Eretria from the rule of 'tyrants' and, at the same time, to oppose the encroachment of Philip's influence. For full discussion of the text, the strategy, the dates and the careers of the generals with bibliography see Harding (*Didymos*: 101–8).

Athens declares war on Philip of Macedon

340/39 Archonship of Theophrastos

211. Philokhoros F162 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 10.34–11.5: And a match was put to the war of the Athenians *against* [the] M[a]cedonian [...] on the one hand all the other ways Philip offended the Athenians whilst (he was) pretending to live in peace, and, in particular, his expedition against Byza[n]tion and Perinthos. These cities he was anxious to bring back to his side for two reasons: both to deprive the Athenians of their grain supply and so that they might not have coastal cities that were providing bases for their fleet and places of refuge for the war against him; and at that time, indeed, he committed [his] greatest transgression by seizing the merchants' ships that were at Hieron. **According to Philokhoros (they were) two hundred and thirty (ships), while Theopompos (FGrHist: 115 F292) (says they were) one hundred and eighty, and from these he amassed seven hundred talents. (That) these actions were perpetrated the year before in the archonship of Theophrastos, the archon after Nikomakhos, as (is reported by) others and, in particular, Philokhoros, who says the following: 'And Khares sailed away to a meeting of the King's generals, leaving behind warships at Hieron for the purpose of gathering together the cargo ships from the Pontos. And Philip, when he perceived that Khares was absent, at first attempted to send his (own) warships to seize the boats, but, being unable to capture (them), transported (his) soldiers over to the other side against Hieron and gained control of the cargo.'**

212. Philokhoros F53–55a = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *To Ammaios* 1.11.3–5: The time when Philip requested that the Thebans allow him passage into Attika, by reminding them of the assistance he gave them in their war against the Phokians, becomes clear from the 'common history'. The details are as follows: After the capture of Olynthos, in the archonship of Themistokles (347/6), Philip made a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Athenians (the Peace of Philokrates). This treaty lasted for seven years up to the archonship of Nikomakhos (341/0). In the following archonship of Theophrastos (340/39) the treaty was dissolved, with both Athens and Philip accusing each other of starting the war. **(F53) The reasons why they went to war, each accusing the other of wrongdoing, and the date when the peace (treaty) was dissolved are revealed with precision by Philokhoros in the sixth (book) of the *Atthis*. I shall cite the**

necessary sections of his account. (F54) ‘Theophrastos of Halai: In this man’s archonship Philip sailed first against Perinthos and attacked it. But, being unsuccessful in that, he brought his siege-equipment to Byzantion and began to besiege it.’ (F55a) Next, after narrating all the accusations that Philip charged Athens with in his letter, he (sc. Philokhoros) makes another entry on this subject, writing as follows: ‘When the People had heard the letter (i.e. from Philip), after Demosthenes had exhorted them to war and had proposed the motion, they voted to destroy the stele, the one that had been set up regarding the peace and alliance with Philip, to man a fleet and to put in motion preparations for war.’

213a. Philokhoros F161 = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 1.29–60: (29) One could perhaps *glimpse* [the] *circumstances* of the speech (i.e. Demosthenes, *Fourth Philippic*) [...from what **Philokhoros** (says) after the heading] ‘*the archon was Nikomakh[os]...*’] *Nothing intelligible can be made of lines 31–45* (46) [...] neither wishing nor [...Philistides the] Oreitan [...] in the archonship of So[sigenes], and [Kleitarkh]os the Eretri[an in the archonship of Nikom]akho[s...]. **These things also [Philokh]oros will confirm [...]** (50) [...] **at the end of Nik[omakhos]’ magistracy** [...] *speech*. Well then, that the *speech has been written* [before...] of magistracy [...] Nik[omakhos...] has been seen [...] **under the heading** [...] **Nikoma[khos...] will show** (55) [...] **concerning the [peace] with Philip [...]** and the *stele* regarding the treaty [...] in the archonship of Theophrastos *Line 58 is unrecoverable* [...] both in every way and completely [...].

213b. Philokhoros F55b = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 1.67–2.2: [Now] as to the fact that (it was) in the archonship of [Theophrasto]s, the archon after Nikomakhos, [that the treaty] *was broken*, it will *clearly suffice* (70) (to quote) Phil[o]khoros, who writes as follows [in his] sixth (book): ‘When [the] People had heard [the letter], after Demosthenes had exhorted [them to] war and had proposed the motion, they *voted* to destroy the stele, [the one that] had been set up [regarding the] peace (col. 2) and *alliance* with Philip, [to man] a fleet [and] *to put in motion preparations for war*.’

Commentary

#211: Current wisdom holds that Philip began his siege of Perinthos, a former ally (scholion to Aiskhines: 2.81) about mid-summer 340 (Hammond and Griffith 1979:568 n. 4; Sealey 1993:187). The Perinthians put up a stout resistance, thanks to some aid from Byzantion and the Persian satraps in the region, so Philip divided his forces and sent half to attack Byzantion (Diodoros: 16.74.2–76.4), which had also been an ally of his (Demosthenes, *First Philippic*: 34; *On the Crown*: 87). Diodoros (and probably his source, Ephoros, whose history ended with the siege of Perinthos) considered Philip's attack on Byzantion the reason for Athens' declaration of war (16.77.2) and he is followed by Jacoby (*Text*: 537–9) amongst others. Most modern scholars, however, accept the version given here that it was the seizure of the grain ships that precipitated that action (e.g. Hammond and Griffith 1979:574–8; Sealey 1993:187–90; Ryder 2000:79). Demosthenes himself is unhelpful; in speech 11.5 he makes no mention of this action in his list of events, but later he mentions it twice in *On the Crown* (72 and 139), in the first of which he explicitly lays the blame for the breaking of the peace on the seizure of the ships. Noteworthy in all this, however, is the reference to collusion between the Athenian general, Khares, and the Persian satraps. It is, of course, to be expected, but it is recorded nowhere else. See further on the text (especially the difficulty with the restoration 'the year before') and historicity of this fragment in *Didymos* (210–16).

#212–13a/b: Didymos and Dionysios are arguing different cases; Dionysios is explicating references to historical events in Aristotle, while Didymos is trying to show that Athens was still at peace when Demosthenes delivered the *Fourth Philippic* (speech 10). Nevertheless, they both independently found some of the same passages in Philokhoros of use. In fact, the fragmentary text of the quotation in Didymos (#213b) can be (and is) restored precisely with the aid of Dionysios. The other passage from Didymos (#213a) is too badly preserved to be very helpful, except to show that he was citing Philokhoros there also in support of the same date. Incidentally, that passage probably contains two quotations from Philokhoros, not one as Jacoby thought. In fact, the text he used, which followed the speculative restorations of Crönert, is undoubtedly wrong. For a full discussion of the text of both passages from Didymos, the thread of his reasoning and the issues raised see *Didymos* (108–16).

It is the series of quotations in Dionysios that is more informative. Not only do we find once again, as in the section on the Olynthian war (#201), the precise, dated entries, but it is clear from what Dionysios says that Philokhoros also included a summary of the contents of Philip's letter of complaint to Athens. It is a great pity that we do not have his text of that, not least because it appears that the *Letter from Philip*, that has come down to us as speech 12 in the corpus of Demosthenes, is not the one referred to here. It was clearly written before the siege of Perinthos had begun, whereas by the time of Demosthenes' reply (speech 11) the siege is a fact. It seems certain that Philip wrote two letters to Athens only a few weeks apart. The first ([Dem. 12]) we have, the second, to which Demosthenes' speech 11 is a reply, we do not. For the progression of events see e.g. Sealey (1993:187). For further details of this problem see Harding, *Didymos* (114, 200).

Philip and Athens seek alliance with Thebes

339/8 Archonship of Lysimakhides

214a. Philokhoros F56a = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *To Ammaios* 1.11.6: After writing about the events that took place during the archonship of Theophrastos, he gives the details of the activities in the year following, after the dissolution of the peace (treaty), when Lysimakhides was archon. I shall set down only the most essential parts of this narrative also. ‘Lysimakhides of Akharnai: in this man’s archonship they laid aside the work on the shipsheds and the arsenal (sc. of Philon), because of the war against Philip. On a motion of Demosthenes they voted that all monies be allocated to the war fund. After Philip had captured Elateia and Kytinion, he sent ambassadors from the Thessalians, the Ainianians, the Aitolians, the Dolopians (and) the Phthiotians to Thebes. During the same time the Athenians sent a group led by Demosthenes as ambassadors (i.e. to Thebes), and they (sc. the Thebans) voted to make an alliance with these (i.e. the Athenians).’

214b. Philokhoros F56b = Didymos, *On Demosthenes* col. 11.37–51: And [the fact that] Ph[i]lip *ordered* it (sc. Nikaia) to be given back to (the) Lo[k]rians *by* (the) Th[e]bans is stated by Philokh[oro]s in his sixth (book) as follows: ‘After Phil[ip] *had captured* Elateia and Kytin[ion] and had sent to Thebes *ambassadors* from (the) The[ssa]lians, (the) Ain[i]anians, (the) Aitolians, (the) Dolopians (and the) Phthiotians, and was demanding (that they) give Nikaia back to the Lokrians in contravention of the resolution of the Amphiktyons – (Nikaia was a place) that the Thebans themselves had taken, after expelling Philip’s garrison that was holding it, when he was in Skythia – to these (ambassadors) they (the Thebans) replied (that) an embassy (would be sent) to Philip to negotiate about the issues.’

Commentary

These two versions of Philokhoros' entry at this point complement each other. Dionysios has begun his quotation before Didymos' and for that reason preserves the valuable archon date. On the other hand, he has clearly left out a section near the end, where he moves straight from the names of the ambassadors Philip sent to Thebes to a reference to the counter deputation from Athens under Demosthenes, then, the Theban decision. Didymos, by contrast, at this point includes the mention of the negotiations between Philip and Thebes over Nikaia, a key fort in eastern Lokris controlling the narrow corridor to Thermopylai, which the Thebans had controlled from the 360s until 346, when Philip had captured it and handed it over to the Thessalians. His quotation includes the otherwise unrecorded information that Philip had at some time garrisoned the town and that Thebes had expelled his forces. Jacoby (*Text*: 332) considers Didymos' version more complete. For problems with the text of Didymos (not least, what is meant by 'in contravention of the resolution of the Amphiktyons'), debate over the date of this embassy and other issues regarding these fragments see *Didymos* (224–8).

Prosecution and death of Theoris the prophetess

325/4? (Archonship of Antikles)

215. Philokhoros F60 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Theoris: Demosthenes (mentions her) in the (speech) *Against Aristogeiton* (25.79), if it is authentic. **Theoris was a prophetess, who was found guilty of impiety and put to death, as Philokhoros writes in (book) six.**

Commentary

Despite Jacoby's reservations (*Text*: 335), Philokhoros may well have had a professional (or even personal; he was probably a teenager at the time) interest in reporting the trial and death of this little known 'prophetess'. Other references to her are in [Demosthenes] 25, *Against Aristogeiton A*: 79–80 and in Plutarch, *Demosthenes*: 14.6. In the first, she is cast in the role of a Lemnian witch, skilled in the art of poison and enchantment, who was justly put to death by an Athenian jury along with her offspring. But there is no knowing how much of this to believe, since this is a standard rhetorical characterization of women with knowledge, and is in this case designed to cast an even worse light on Aristogeiton's brother, the person who acquired her artifice from the serving maid who informed against her. The first prosecution of Aristogeiton (for the second see Worthington 1992:287–312) probably belongs in the archon year 325/4. In that case, if the speech belongs to that trial, we can conclude that the prosecution and execution of Theoris had happened sometime before. Unfortunately, as we can see from Harpokration's remark, the authenticity of the speech was doubted in antiquity and a modern critic considers it the work of a later rhetorician (Sealey 1993:237–9). So, we are unable to be confident even about the date. And, we get little help from the other reference to her in Plutarch. There we are told that Demosthenes was himself the prosecutor of a *priestess*, Theoris, for a variety of crimes, amongst which was teaching slaves to cheat their masters, and that he was actually the person who demanded the death penalty. The discrepant details are troubling and Plutarch fails to state his source.

In sum, as Jacoby says (*Text*: 335), all we can say for certain about this fragment is that Philokhoros recorded the trial and execution of a certain Theoris (we cannot even be sure he called her a 'prophetess', that may be an inference by the lexicographer from the text he was commenting on) at some uncertain date between c.357 and 322 (the probable limits of his sixth book).

Harpalos' money

325/4 (Archonship of Antikles)

216. Philokhoros F163 = [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* = *Moralia* 846AB: After Harpalos had fled to Athens with the money (i.e. from Alexander's treasury), at first he (sc. Demosthenes) was against his being allowed to enter. But when he (sc. Harpalos) sailed in with one thousand Darics and the Athenians were wanting to hand him over to Antipater, he (sc. Demosthenes) spoke in opposition and proposed that they deposit the money on the Acropolis, without his telling the People the amount. **When Harpalos claimed <that the number of talents he had brought with him was> seven hundred, <the amount taken up onto the Acropolis> was found (to be) <three hundred> and fifty, or a little more, as Philokhoros tells.**

Commentary

The restorations of the sums of money in the text are supplied from Photios, *Bibliotheka*: 285 and are confirmed by Hypereides, *Against Demosthenes*: 5.10. This fragment is the only statement from Philokhoros that we have concerning one of the most famous trials in Athenian legal history (almost on a par with the trial of Sokrates) namely, the prosecution of Demosthenes in 323/2 for accepting bribes from Harpalos, the childhood friend and one-time treasurer of Alexander the Great. The prosecution was at the hands of the *polis*. Ten advocates for the prosecution were chosen. We have the work of one, Deinarkhos (see Worthington 1992:41–77, 85–285), and a fragmentary papyrus copy of another, Hypereides (see Whitehead 2000:354–472).

Harpalos fled from Babylon, where he had been living in high style, on the news that Alexander had indeed returned from India and was purging those who had taken advantage of his absence. In 324 he came to Athens, where he had been given honorary citizenship, bringing with him a fleet of ships, 6,000 mercenaries and 5,000 talents. He was refused entry. He retired to Cape Tainaron in the Peloponnese, at that time a collecting place for soldiers for hire, but returned to Athens thereafter alone, except for a certain (undisclosed) sum of money. On the advice of Demosthenes he was admitted, but kept under guard, while his money was to be taken up to the Acropolis. Subsequently, after he escaped, it was revealed that much of what was supposed to be on the Acropolis was missing and trials ensued. Demosthenes proposed that the Council on the Areiopagos review the evidence and make recommendations in the form of an *apophasis* (MacDowell 1978:190–1). To his surprise he was on the top of their list of bribetakers. He was tried, found guilty and fined fifty talents (Diodoros: 17.108.4–8; Plutarch, *Demosthenes*: 25.1–26.2). Instead of paying his fine, he went into exile, where he stayed until after the death of Alexander the Great. Whether he was guilty or not (see Pausanias: 2.33.4–5), the accusation and conviction destroyed Demosthenes' carefully cultivated claim for incorruptibility and damaged his reputation for all time (Harding 2000:247–8).

The flight of Harpalos, his money, the trial of Demosthenes and the connection of the whole incident with Alexander's exiles decree have been the subject of numerous studies (see, for example, the review of the issue in Worthington 1992:41–77; cf. Sealey 1993:212–15, 265–

7). These topics are too big to be discussed here. Suffice it to say that it appears that Philokhoros provides independent support for the sum of money that Harpalos claimed he brought and for the sum that was actually found on the Acropolis. His comment, if he made one, on the veracity of Harpalos' claim or the truth of Demosthenes' defence, or for that matter any of the other issues, is not preserved.

Death of Demosthenes

322/1 (Archonship of Philokles)

217. Philokhoros F164 = [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* = *Moralia* 847A: **Philokhoros says that he (sc. Demosthenes) died from drinking poison**, while Satyros the historian (says) that the reed, with which he began to write the letter (to Antipater), was poisoned and (that) he died after putting it in his mouth. But Eratosthenes (says) that for a long time, out of fear of the Macedonians, he had worn a poisoned circlet around his arm. Yet others say he died by asphixiation, while some have said he imbibed the poison from his signet-ring.

Commentary

Demosthenes died by suicide at the temple of Poseidon on the island of Kalauria (Poros) in 322/1, where he had taken refuge from Arkhias, a Makedonian bounty-hunter. There were many theories about the manner of his dying. For another ancient review of the way he died see Plutarch, *Demosthenes*: 29–30.

The administration of Demetrios of Phaleron, 318/17–308/7

218a. Philokhoros F64a = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Nomophylakes: A magistracy amongst the Athenians was called by this name. It differed from the Thesmothetai. Deinarkhos (mentions it) in the (speeches) *Against Himeraios* and *Against Pytheas*. **Philokhoros in the seventh (book) gave a detailed description of these, (saying) amongst other things that they compelled the magistrates to apply the laws.**

218b. Philokhoros F64b = *Lexikon rhetoricum Cantabrigense* p. 351.10N: Nomophylakes: **They were different from the Thesmothetai, as Philokhoros (says) in the seventh (book). For the magistrates used to go up onto the Areios Pagos, while the nomophylakes, used to sit <in> the seating area facing <the nine> archons. They also conducted the procession to Pallas (Athena). And they compelled the magistrates to apply the laws, and in both the Assembly and the Boule they used to sit with the Prohedroi, (their function being to) prevent (them, i.e. the Prohedroi? the People?) doing anything to the disadvantage of the Polis. They were seven (in number) and they were established, as Philokhoros says, at the time when Ephialtes left the council from the Areios Pagos only (charge of) matters concerning the body (i.e. trials for intentional homicide).**

Cf. Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. The Nomophylakes. Some people think these were the same as the Thesmothetai, but that is not so. For the Thesmothetai used to go up onto the Areios Pagos crowned in the ancestral manner, while the Nomophylakes wore white headbands and sat in the seating area facing the nine archons. And they prepared the procession for Pallas (Athena), whenever the wooden statue was carried down to the seashore. And they compelled the magistrates to apply the laws, and in the Assembly they sat with the Prohedroi, (their function being to) prevent (them, i.e. the Prohedroi) putting anything to the vote that seemed to them (i.e. the Nomophylakes) contrary to the law or to the disadvantage of the Polis.

219. Philokhoros F65 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 6.46, p. 245C: **And Philokhoros in the seventh (book) of *Atthis* says, ‘The “supervisors of women” (*gynaikonomoi*) together with the Areiopagites watched over gatherings in the houses both at**

weddings and at festivals in general’.

Commentary

Following the defeat of Athens and her allies in the Hellenic War or Lamian War (for which see *Documents*: no. 124; Habicht 1997:36–42), the Athenians lost control of their foreign policy to Makedon. In 318/17 Kassander, son of Antipater, appointed Demetrios, son of Phanostratos, of the deme Phaleron as *epimeletes* or supervisor over the city. Thus began the ten-year rule of this philosopher-politician, pupil of Aristotle and Theophrastos. Given his association with those less-than-democratic educators, one should not be surprised that he was prepared to play the puppet to Macedonian domination. Nor should one be surprised at the conservative agenda of his administration. This included the creation of the board of seven *nomophylakes* (the connection of this body with the reforms of Ephialtes in #218b is simply confusion, *pace* Jacoby, *Text*: 338–9; it is not mentioned in the parallel citation from Photios, nor even hinted at by any other evidence), who exercised an overall supervision of activity (minimal as it was) in the assembly. Also in line with conservative philosophical moral theory was the control that his *gynaikonomoí* wielded over all aspects of private life through their application of his sumptuary laws against extravagance, though the name given to that body implies its sexist origins. Furthermore, he held a census (Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai*: 6.272C; cf. Hansen 1985:28–36), which was surely in some way connected to his restriction of the franchise that eliminated those with a property rating below 1,000 drachmas, even though, to be fair, we should note that that was a less restrictive criterion than the 2,000 drachma-limit imposed by Antipater (Diodoros: 18.18; Plutarch, *Phokion*: 28). This move no doubt pleased the wealthier members of Athenian society, who had been willing to support such a restriction of the franchise as long ago as the time of the Thirty Tyrants, and those same people surely applauded his elimination of the liturgy system, especially the trierarchy, the most expensive tax upon the rich. Indeed, that particular liturgy was hardly necessary anymore, since Demetrios acquiesced in the virtual elimination of the Athenian navy (reduced to 30 ships).

To be sure Demetrios could look back to the laws of Solon for precedents for some of his legislation, especially his sumptuary laws, though in a manner typical of such conservative moralizers his own life-style was the very antithesis of his legislation. It is also true that the movement to restrict the ‘excesses’ of fifth-century democracy had

been progressing during the fourth (see Rhodes 1980:305–23), not least under the administrations of Euboulos and Lykourgos (on whom see Mitchel 1970). But their restrictions and tightening of control had been designed to make Athens more capable of maintaining her independence in a rapidly changing world (for a perspective on this see Harding 1995:105–25). Demetrios, by contrast, accepted that Athens no longer had a role to play in international affairs, except in support of his Makedonian master Kassander, and by his legislation hastened her transformation into a cultural, rather than a political, centre. Maybe, he was only being realistic, but there were those who still hankered for the past. One had been his own brother, Himeraios, who had died along with other nationalists at the hand of Antipater in 322 (for other brothers who chose radically different paths in this difficult time see Shear 1978). Another was Demokhares, nephew of Demosthenes, who was a leader of the nationalist opposition. One cannot help wondering what opinions, if any, Philokhoros, who died for his nationalist stance during the Khremonidian war, expressed upon this period, through which he lived as a young adult. For a recent modern survey of the administration of Demetrios see Habicht (1997:53–66), though his work has not replaced the earlier study by Ferguson (1911:38–94) in either thoughtfulness or thoroughness. Less accessible, but more detailed than either, is the unpublished dissertation by Williams (1982, *passim*, but especially 169–219).

Demetrios of Phaleron and his supporters are driven out of Athens; Demetrios Poliorketes and his father Antigonos are welcomed in

307/6 Archonship of Anaxikrates

220. Philokhoros F66 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Deinarkhos* 3: This is the history of the man's (i.e. Deinarkhos') life. Each detail is provided by testimony from the histories of Philokhoros and from what he (Deinarkhos) has written about himself in the speech *Against Proxenos*, which was delivered after his return from exile (in 292/1)... That's what Deinarkhos (says) about himself. **But Philokhoros, (writing) in his *Attic Histories* about the exile of those who overthrew the democracy and about their return again, says the following: 'For, when Anaxikrates was archon, at the very beginning of his term the city of Megara was captured. And Demetrios (sc. Poliorketes) came back from Megara and began to make his preparations (for attack) against Mounikhia. Once he had demolished the walls, he handed (the place) over to the People. Later, many of the citizens were impeached, amongst them even Demetrios of Phaleron. Of those who were impeached, those who did not stay for the trial were condemned to death by a vote of the People, but those who obeyed (the summons) were acquitted. That is <from> the eighth (book).**

221. Philokhoros F165 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 15.52, p. 697A: Philokhoros says that the Athenians sang songs of victory (paians) in honour of Antigonos and Demetrios. These had been composed by Hermippos (?) of Kyzikos, after a competition in the writing of paians had been held, in which Hermokles (?) had been selected the winner.

222. Philokhoros F166 = Scholion to Pindar, *Nemean* 3.2 ('the holy month at Nemea'): Philokhoros says that the Athenians voted that the whole month Demetrian be designated a holy month, that is to say, one long festival.

223. Philokhoros F48 = *Lexikon rhetoricum Cantabrigense* p. 355.3N: *Paralos* and *Salaminia*: These triremes were kept throughout for emergency services and they had their own stewards voted for them. They used them if they needed to summon back a general to stand trial, as (happened in the case of) Alkibiades. The *Paralos* took its name from a local hero. Thucydides mentions the *Paralos* and *Salaminia* in (the) third (3.33.2; 3.77.3) and Aristophanes in *Birds* (1204). Aristotle knows the *Ammonias* and the *Paralos* (*Ath. Pol.*: 61.7), as does Deinarkhos in the (speech) *Against Timokrates*.

Philokhoros in the sixth(?) (book) knows them as four, the first two (being) *Ammonias* and *Paralos*, additional ones (being) *Demetrias* and *Antigonis*.

Commentary

It is not unlikely that Philokhoros, nationalist as he was, welcomed the expulsion of Kassander's Makedonian garrison from the Peiraieus and the return of democratic government and some degree of independence that was brought to Athens by Demetrios Poliorketes, son of Antigonos the One-Eyed. The capture of Mounikhia and the departure of Demetrios of Phaleron (he ended up in Alexandria and became an adviser to the Ptolemies) are recorded by the *Marmor Parium*, part B, epochs 20 and 21, by Diodoros: 20.45.1–46.4 and by Plutarch, *Demetrios*: 8–10. They also record the extravagant reaction of the Athenians. On a motion of Stratokles they voted to erect statues of Demetrios and Antigonos and to set up an altar to them as *Soteres* (Saviours). They changed the name of one of the months to Demetrian (#222; see Plutarch, *Demetrios*: 12.2; Jacoby, *Text*: 542–3). They also added two new tribes, Antigonis and Demetrias, to the old ten Kleisthenic tribes (for the way that was managed see Traill 1975:26–9) and, as indicated in #223, named two new state vessels after the liberators. NB In the case of the last-mentioned fragment something is wrong with the book number, since the information about the two ships cannot belong before 307/6, unless Jacoby, *Text*: 327–8, is correct in hypothesizing that Philokhoros wrote a digression on the Sacred Triremes either in the context of F47 in c.352/1 or in his discussion of Lykourgos and proleptically inserted this information. For more on the Athenian reaction at this time see Habicht (1997:67–74) and, for an understanding of the Antigonid viewpoint, see Billows (1990:189–236).

Philokhoros predicts the recall of the exiles

306/5 (Archonship of Koroibos)

224. Philokhoros F67 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Deinarkhos* 3: In the ninth (book) he (Philokhoros) says: When this year (the archonship of Anaxikrates, 307/6) was finished, and the next was beginning, the following portent was witnessed on the acropolis: a dog entered the temple of Athena Polias and slipped (from there) into the Pandroseion. It went up onto the altar of Zeus Herkeios, which is located beneath the olive tree, and lay down there. It is an ancestral custom amongst the Athenians that dogs are not allowed up onto the Acropolis. About the same time, in the sanctuary, in the daytime, when the sun was out and the sky clear, a star was seen clearly for some time. Enquiry was made of us concerning this portent and manifestation, what they might point to, and we said that both were indicating a return of exiles, but not one that would result from a change in political affairs. Rather (it would happen) under the existing constitution. And it turned out that this judgement was fulfilled.

Commentary

This anecdote incorporates an interesting reference by Philokhoros to his own activity as a *prophetes*. The exiles referred to are, of course, those who fled with Demetrios of Phaleron (#220 above), and their return in the archonship of Philippos is noted in the ghost fragment below (#226). For the association between Deinarkhos and Demetrios of Phaleron, the orator's exile in 307/6 and his return in 292/1 see Worthington (1992:5–7)

Demetrios initiated into the Mysteries

302/1 (Archonship of Nikokles)

225a. Philokhoros FF69–70a = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Of the ‘epoptai’: Hypereides (refers to them) in the (speech) *For Phryne*. The initiates at Eleusis who achieved the second level of initiation were said to be ‘epoptai’. That is made clear from the speech of Demosthenes and **from the tenth (book) of Philokhoros**.

225b. Philokhoros FF69–70b = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. A non-epopteus: Hypereides (uses this term) in the (speech) *For Phryne*. A person who has not become an ‘epopteus’. **What it means to become an ‘epopteus’ is made clear by Philokhoros in the tenth (book, where he says), (F69) ‘He disgraces all the sacred rites associated with initiation as a *mystes* and as an *epopteus*,’ and again (F70) ‘So, something unique happened for Demetrios. Unlike everyone else, he alone became a *mystes* and an *epopteus* at one and the same time, and the customary times for the rites (of initiation) were changed for him.’**

Commentary

As so often happens, the honeymoon between Athens and Demetrios Poliorketes did not last long. His behaviour became erratic and outraged the citizens' sensibilities. The decline in his popularity is well outlined by Plutarch (*Demetrios*: 24–7). Amongst the outrages he committed at this time was the one excerpted by Harpokration, which is laid out in more detail by Plutarch (*Demetrios*: 26) and also mentioned by Diodoros (20.110). The circumstances assumed by both would place this demand by Demetrios, that he immediately be initiated fully into the Mysteries, just before he was called back by Antigonos to Asia to fight at the battle of Ipsos (301/0), where they were defeated and his father killed. If the demand was outrageous, the tricks employed by Stratokles to manipulate the months to make this all possible were ridiculous. Jacoby (*Text*: 346–7) generously suggests that the haste to compress the normal procedure for initiation might have been caused by the immediacy of Demetrios' need to return to Asia. Further, regarding the presumably unexpected (for a chronicler) expression of opinion in the text above ('he disgraces all the sacred rites...'), Jacoby is probably right in thinking that these were not Philokhoros' words, but represent a quotation by him of the utterance of the *dadoukhos*, Pythodoros, whose lone objection to Demetrios' demand was known to Plutarch (*Demetrios*: 26.3).

Deinarkhos and other exiles return

292/1 Archonship of Philippos

226. Philokhoros (?) F167 = Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Deinarkhos* 9: Philippos: In this man's (archonship) a return was granted by king Demetrios to Deinarkhos and the other exiles.

Commentary

This is sure to be derived from the *Atthis*, even though Philokhoros is not mentioned (cf. #196, #197, #202). It is the last datable fragment from Philokhoros. For more on the history of this period see Ferguson (1911:95–141) and Habicht (1997:67–97).

Appendix 1

TRANSLATION OF REMAINING UNASSIGNED FRAGMENTS BY AUTHOR

The most interesting of these fragments contain references to obscure cults and topographical features both inside and outside Attika. Some are relevant to the political and legal organization of Athens. Most are unassignable because they lack a book number, or the one referred to conflicts with any likely context. Not a few are merely names or ethnics, cited by the lexicographers for their strangeness. Some are incomprehensible. They are translated here for the sake of completeness. Only a very few fragments have been excluded, on the grounds that their attribution to the *Atthis* is quite uncertain. Commentary on the 28 fragments of Androtion that appear in this appendix will be found in my *Androtion and the Atthis* (1994). Some short notes have been added on the more important amongst the others. For discussion of the rest, the reader is referred to Jacoby's analysis in *FGrHist*, 3b, Supplements 1 and 2.

Hellanikos

227. Hellanikos F4 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F41) = Photios, *Lexikon* a630: Haimon. The mountain, in the neuter. Hekataios (mentions it) throughout (*FGrHist*: 1 F167), as do Dionysios (*FGrHist*: 687 F3) and **Hellanikos in (book) one of *Atthis*** and Timaios (*FGrHist*: 566 F76) and Eudoxos.

228a. Hellanikos F5a (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F42a) = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Mounikhia: Demosthenes (mentions this) in the (speech) For Ktesiphon (18.107). A place by the seashore in Attika. **Hellanikos in (book) two of *Atthis* says it got its name from a certain king Mounykhos, son of Pantakles.**

228b. Hellanikos F5b (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F42b) = Scholion to Demosthenes 18.107 (Dilts): ‘In Mounykhia.’ Mounykhia is a place near the Peiraieus, where there is a sanctuary of Artemis Mounykhia. **Diodoros (*FGrHist*: 372 F39) tells how Mounykhia got its name, citing the account of Hellanikos. He says that once the Thracians campaigned against the inhabitants of Minyan Orkhomenos in Boiotia and drove them out from there. These people came as refugees into Attika in the time of king Mounykhos. He entrusted this place to them to live in and for that reason they named it, Mounykhia, in honour of the king.**

Note: For this eponymous hero of Mounykhia in the Peiraieus see Kearns (1989:186–7).

229. Hellanikos F7 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F45A) = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Pegai: Andokides (mentions this) in the (speech) *On the Peace* (3.3), if it is authentic. **Pegai (is) a place in Megara, as Hellanikos says in (the) second (book) of the *Atthis*.**

230. Hellanikos F8 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F45) = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Hierophant: Hypereides says somewhere, ‘I have the daughter of the dadoukhos, not of the hierophant’ ... **Concerning the clan of the hierophants Hellanikos has provided clear information in (book) two of *Atthis*.**

Note: The hierophant (‘revealer of sacred rites/objects’), the chief official at Eleusis, was chosen from the Eumolpidae. For his role and that of the other officiating functionaries at the Mysteries see Clinton (1974). Cf. Androtion F1.

231. Hellanikos F9 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F3) = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Stephanephoros: Antiphon (uses the term) in the (speech)

Against Nikokles. There was a hero-shrine of Stephanephoros in Athens, it seems. Stephanephoros might be one of the sons that Herakles had by the daughters of Thestios. He is mentioned by Hellanikos in (the) second (book) of *Phoronis*. **Or perhaps the hero-shrine belonged to the Attic Stephanephoros, who is mentioned also by the same Hellanikos in (book) two of *Atthis*.**

Note: Nothing is known of such a hero. See Kearns (1989:198).

232. Hellanikos F13 (Fowler, *Hellanikos* F163)/Phanodemos F3 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Birds* 872 (ed. Dunbar) ('So, Artemis is no longer Kolainis, but Akalanthis'): Kolainis is an eponym for Artemis...**Hellanikos says that Kolainos, a descendant of Hermes, founded the sanctuary of Artemis Kolainis in response to an oracle. So, too, does Phanodemos in the fourth (book).**

Note: The sanctuary of Artemis Kolainis is at Myrrhinous, where local legend claimed that Kolainos ruled before the time of Kekrops (Pausanias: 1.31.5). Kearns (1989:178) thinks that he was possibly a 'genuine founder-hero and archetypal priest', while Jacoby (*Text*: 178) thinks he was invented to explain the epithet.

Kleidemos

233. Kleidemos F1/F9 = *Synagoge Lex*, p. 326.24, s.v. Agrai: A place outside the city of Athens, where the lesser mysteries of Demeter are celebrated, (the ones) that are called ‘the mysteries in Agrai’. So, (it is described) in (the work) of Asklepios. Pherekrates in *To the Crones* (writes), ‘Right away when we took our seats at Agrai.’ And (there is) a sanctuary of Agraian Artemis there. Plato in the *Phaidros* (229C) (says) ‘...at the place where we cross over to the (temple of Artemis) in Agrai.’ **And Kleidemos in the first (book) of *Atthis* (says): ‘Well now, <that’s about> (?) the upper reaches of the Ilissos; in the direction of Agra (lies?) Eileithia. Formerly the name for this hill, which is now called Agra, (was) Helikon. And the hearth of Helikonian Poseidon (is) on the top.’ And in the fourth (i.e. book of the *Atthis*) (F9) (Kleidemos says) ‘to the sanctuary of the Mother Goddess in Agrai.’**

Note: The sanctuary of Artemis Agrotera stood outside the city on the Ilissos at Agrai (the village; Agra is the name of the nearby hill. Cf. Pausanias 1.19.6). Her festival took place on the sixth of Boedromion (Parke 1977:54). Agrai was also the site of the ‘Lesser Mysteries’ of Demeter, which took place in Anthesterion. By the fifth century the ceremony there constituted the first stage in initiation into the ‘Greater Mysteries’, which was celebrated in Boedromion. This was the process that Demetrios tried to bypass in #225a–b. See Parke (1977:122–4). At some time the worship of the ‘Mother’ intruded (or was revived) here (Parker 1996:188–98). This is the context of the reference in F9.

234. Kleidemos F2 = Harpokration, *Lexikon*, s.v. Melanippeion: Lykourgos (refers to this) in *Against Lykophron*. There is a hero-shrine of Melanippos, the son of Theseus, as Asklepiades says in *Characters of Tragedy*. **Kleidemos in (book) one of *Atthis* says it was in Melite.**

Note: This is the only reference to a hero-shrine for Melanippos (Kearns 1989:184). For his birth to Perigoune, the daughter of Sinis, by Theseus see Plutarch (*Theseus*: 8). Kearns (1989:122) reconstructs a composite genealogy for him and a number of other names associated with the deme Melite.

235. Kleidemos F3 = Konstant. Porphy., *On Themes* II p. 48.9. Bonn: A part of Makedonia is called Maketa, as Marsyas (says) in the first (book) of *Makedonika* (*FGrHist*: 135–6 F10)... **But Kleidemos**

in the first (book) of *Atthis* knows the whole of Makedonia as having the name Maketia, (because he writes) ‘and they were expelled beyond Aigialos, above the (place) known as Maketia.’

236a. Kleidemos F5a = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 14.79 p. 660AB: That the art of cooking was respected can be learned from the (experience of) heralds at Athens. **For these occupied the position of cooks and butchers, as Kleidemos says in the first (book) of *Protogonia* ...’** For a long time heralds used to perform as ox-slayers and preparers and cutters of meat, even as pourers of wine.’ And they used to call them heralds euphemistically, and nowhere is there a list of pay for cooks, but (there is) for heralds.

236b. Kleidemos F5b = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 14.80 p. 660DE: **In the first (book) of *Atthis* Kleidemos reveals that the tribe of cooks enjoyed the honours due to craftsmen, and also that it was part of their task to assemble the People.**

236c. Kleidemos F5c = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 10.26 p. 425E: **Kleidemos says that cooks were called heralds.**

237. Kleidemos F6 = Hesykhios, s.v. Wells of Agamemnon. Historians record that Agamemnon dug wells around Aulis and in many places in Greece. **Kleidemos in the second (eleventh, MSS) of the *Atthis*....**

Note: The book number given in the MSS is impossible.

238. Kleidemos F11 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 6.26 p. 235A: **Kleidemos says in the *Atthis*, ‘And they were chosen as “sitters-at-the-side” (*parasitōi*) for Herakles.**

239. Kleidemos F12 = Hesykhios, s.v. Seventh ox: ****that it is food and sacred for Selene, Kleitodemos says in *Atthis*.**

240. Kleidemos F23 = Hesykhios, s.v. Proeresia. Sacrifices made before ploughing. **Kleidemos calls them Proarktouria.**

Note: This agricultural festival was a time for tithe-giving to the sanctuary of Eleusis. It took place in the autumn in the month Pyanepsion. See Parke (1977:73–5). Kleidemos’ name is calendric (the rising of Arktouros was about mid-September) rather than agricultural.

241. Kleidemos F24 = Hesykhios, s.v. Prooikia: (Mentioned) **in Kleitodemos.**

242. Kleidemos F25 = Philodemos, *On Piety* 51 p. 23 (Gomperz): .../her to Hestia.../and Sophokles in [*Ina*]/*khos* calls the Earth (the) *moth/er* of the Gods./[And] in *Triptolem[os]*/(he says that) Hestia *is* also (mother of the Gods?)/**And Kleidemos.../Mother of the Gods,** which some people have even put/forth in sacred speeches./But Melanip[pi]des sa/ys that Demete[r and]/(the) Mother of the Gods/are one.

243. Kleidemos F26 = Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Aidruta ('unstable', 'unsettled'): Evil things, accursed things, things which others would not settle with them. **And even the Semnai Theai (sc. Erinnyes) have been called <aidrutai> by Kleidemos.**

244. Kleidemos F27 = Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Hyes ('Rainy'): **An epithet of Dionysos, as Kleidemos (says), 'Whenever they celebrate the sacrificial rites to him at the time when the god makes the rain.'**

Androtion

245. Androtion F7 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Delphoi: **There exists also Delphousia, a city in Arkadia, as Androtion (says) in (book) two of *Atthis*.**

246. Androtion F12 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Halikarnassos: A city in Karia... The citizen (is) a Halikarnassean, like an Apsyrtean. **Androtion in the third (book) of *Atthis* says Halikarnassian.**

247. Androtion F13 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Kapai: A Hellespontine city. **Androtion (mentions it) in (book) three of *Atthis*.** The ethnic is Kapaian, like Napaian.

248. Androtion F14 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Ophryneion: Demosthenes in the (speech) *Against Apatourios* (33.20). **It is a city in the Troad, as Androtion makes clear in (book) three of *Atthis*.**

249. Androtion F15 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Parparon: An Aeolic place in Asia, where they record Thucydides died, as Apollodoros (says) in the second (book) of his *Chronika*. Some call it Perperene. The citizen (is) a Parparonian, from the genitive Parparonos. The feminine is Parparonia. **Androtion, however, in (the) third (book) of *Atthis* says Parpar[on]iotai.**

250. Androtion F16 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Clouds* 984–5 ('That's old-fashioned stuff and Dipolieia-like and full of cicadas and Kekeides and Bouphonias'): Bouphonia. A very ancient festival of the Athenians. **For they say that in the Diipoleia (for the correct spelling, Dipolieia, see Dover 1968: *ad loc.*) a bull ate the cake that had been prepared for the sacrifice. And a certain Thaulon, just as he was, killed the bull with an axe, as Androtion also has mentioned in the course of his fourth (?) (book).**

251. Androtion F17 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Argennousa: An island close to the mainland of the Troad, off the promontory Argennon, from which (is derived) 'argennoeis' and by contraction 'argennous' and 'argennousa'. **The ethnic is Argennousian; Androtion in the fourth (book) of *Atthis*, with the iota.**

252. Androtion F20 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Malieus: The eponymous city of the Malians. ... The citizen (is called) Malieus. There is also a Maliac gulf. **The term Maleates is also used; Androtion (in book) five of *Atthis*.**

253. Androtion F21 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Methouriades: **Islands between Aigina and Attika, near Troizen. Androtion in (the) fifth (book) of Atthis.** The ethnic (is) Methouriean.

254. Androtion F23 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Neosi: Demosthenes (mentions this) in *Against Aiskhines* (19.148). It is a city in Phokis, which Herodotos in (book) eight (8.32.1, 33.1) calls Neon, **but Androtion in (book) six of Atthis (calls) Neones.**

255. Androtion F25 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Airai: A city in Makedonia. There is also another one in Ionia. The ethnic (of the latter) is Airean, but of the one in Makedonia is Airaian. **There exists also (another) by (the) Hellespont, the ethnic of which (is) Airatan in (the work of) Androtion in (book) six of Atthis.**

256. Androtion F26 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Gresinos: A city in the Khersonese. **The ethnic is Gresinian, as Androtion (says in book) six of Atthis.**

257. Androtion F27 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Kalydna: An island. And a Theban city, (named) after Kalydnos, son of Ouranos. It is also called Kalydnos. The citizen (is called) a Kalydnaian and, in the feminine, Kalydnite. **And (there is) Apollo Kalydnean and Kalydnian, as Androtion (says in book) six of Atthis.**

258. Androtion F28 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Telos: An island of the Cyclades, (named) after (its) founder, Telos. It was also called Agathoussa, according to Jason. The ethnic is Telian. **Androtion (uses it in the) sixth (book) of Atthis.**

259. Androtion F29 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Metakhoion: A fort in Boiotia between Orkhomenos and Koroneia. Ephoros in (the) thirteenth (book). The ethnic is ‘from Metakhoion’, just like the (ethnic) ‘from Oion’, as has been claimed. Or (the ethnic is) Metakhoiate. For, indeed, Oios (is) a citadel and its ethnic is Oiate. **But Androtion in the seventh (book) uses the periphrastic expression (sc. for the ethnic) ‘inhabitant of Metakhoion’.**

260. Androtion F31 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Stryme: **A city in Thrace, according to Androtion (in the) seventh.**

261. Androtion F32 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Akontion: A city in Arkadia, (named) after Akontios, son of Lykaon. **There is another in Euboia, according to Xenagoras (FGrHist: 240 F33) and Androtion in (the) eighth (book).**

262. Androtion F49 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Oinous: **A fortress in Lakonia, according to Androtion and Didymos.**

263a. Androtion F54a = Aelian, *Varia Historia* 8.6: They say that none of the ancient Thrakians knew his letters, but indeed all the barbarians who live in Europe used to consider it very disgraceful to be literate. The (barbarians) in Asia, on the other hand, were more literate. **On this basis, you know, they dare to say that not even Orpheus was a wise man, because he was a Thrakian, but that, in any case, the myths about him have been falsified. That is what Androtion says, if anyone finds him a credible witness about the illiteracy and lack of education of the Thrakians.**

263b. Androtion F54b = Scholion BD to Aelius Aristeides, *In Defence of the Four* 165.4 ('And they praise Homer on the grounds that he was both the first poet and the most polished'): Homer is the oldest, as we know. And if someone says, 'and yet Orpheus lived before him,' we say, 'yes, Orpheus lived before him, but Onomakritos, who lived later than Homer, transformed Orpheus' doctrines into verses' (i.e. put them down in writing). And Aiskhines in the (speech) *Against Timarkhos* (1.142) says, 'I shall speak about Homer, whom we rank amongst the oldest and wisest poets....' **That he (sc. Homer) was indeed older is testified to by Androtion and Aiskhines and Herodotos (2.53).**

264a. Androtion F55/Philokhoros F169b = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 9.17 p. 375BC: **And there was even an ancient custom, as Androtion tells, not to sacrifice a sheep that was not shorn or had not had young, in the interest of promoting the increase of the flocks. For that reason they used to eat the animals that were already mature. 'But the suitors eat the fattened hogs.'** And even now the priestess of Athena is not to sacrifice a ewe-lamb or taste cheese. And Philokhoros (F169b) says that during a time when there was a shortage of oxen, a law was made that they (sc. the Athenians) abstain from (eating) living creatures, intending that they (sc. the animals) gather together and procreate by virtue of the fact that they were not being sacrificed.

264b. Philokhoros F169a = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 1.16 p. 9CD: **And Philokhoros reports that it was forbidden for anyone at Athens to eat an unshorn sheep, because once the birth of these animals failed.**

265. Androtion F56 = *Etymologicum Genuinum* (E. Miller, *Mélanges*, p. 71) and *Etymologicum Magnum* (Gaisford), s.v. Brisaaios: Thus (one refers to) Dionysos. And if (it is spelled) with an iota, it is in contrast to being sleepy (*brizo*), (because he is) the one who sets in motion. But if (it is spelled) with an eta, (it comes) from the **Lesbian promontory of Brese, which Androtion mentions. Because he says that the temple of the god in Brise was established by Makar.**

266. Androtion F59 = Pollux, *Onomastikon* 8.121: Well-known

lawcourts: ‘The Heliaia’; ‘the Triangular’, which Deinarkhos mentions; ‘Middle’; ‘Greater’; ‘Stuffed in’. Lysias mentions the ‘Stuffed in’ and the ‘Greater’. But the Eleven pass judgement in the ‘Stuffed in’ (court). ‘Metiokhos’ (court). **‘Kallion’, which Androtion mentions.** ‘The (court) at Lykos’, after which (is named) also the company of the wolf, and (the) hero is seated there in the form of a beast. Of old there gathered together at that place those who joined in bribing the lawcourts. ‘Meti<0>khos’ (court) is a great court, so named after (the) architect Meti<0>khos.

267. Androtion F63 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Aitolia: **There is also a city in the Peloponnese (called) Aitolia, which is listed with the Lakonian cities by Androtion, and in (?) of Atthis.**

268. Androtion F64 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Bolissos: An Aiolian city on a promontory near (the city of Khios). Thucydides calls it Boliskos in (book) eight (8.24.3). And they say that Homer used to spend his leisure hours in this citadel, according to Ephoros (*FGrHist*: 70 F103). **Androtion spells (the name) with one sigma.**

269. Androtion F65 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Thyrea: There is also a Thyrion, (spelled) with an iota, in Akarnania. The ethnic is Thyrieans, like Sounieans. **But Androtion writes Thourian.**

270. Androtion F66 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Itea: A deme of the tribe Akamantis. A demesman (is an) Iteaian. **But Androtion used to write (the word) with three syllables.**

271. Androtion F67 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Kropia: A deme of the tribe Leontis. Phrynikhos speaks of Kropias. **But Androtion calls the deme Krobeis.**

272. Androtion F68 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Tetrapolis: In Attika. Comprising four demes and cities: Oinoe, Probalinthos, Trikory[n]thos, Marathon. **Androtion says, ‘of the tetrapolis’ (using a spelling) with a delta (i.e. tetrapolidos).**

Phanodemos

273. Phanodemos F1 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Hekate's island: Lykourgos (mentions this in the speech) *Against Menesaikhmos*. (It is) a little island (that) lies in front of Delos. **It is called by some Psammetikhe, for example, Phanodemos in (book) one [of the Deliaka?].** Semos says it was called Psammetikhe in (book) one <of the Deliaka?> on account of the fact that the god was honoured with *psammeta*. *Psammeta* are a kind of cake made of barley, mixed with oil and honey.

Note: There is no other evidence that Phanodemos wrote a work on Delian affairs. The name was perhaps the title of Semos' book and the title has been transposed (Jacoby, *Text*: 175). The island lies between Delos and Rheneia.

274. Phanodemos F7 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 3.81 p. 114C: The Egyptians call their sour bread 'kyllestis'. Aristophanes mentions it in *Danaans*...so, too, do Hekataios (*FGrHist*: 1 F322) and Herodotos (2.77.4) **and Phanodemos in (book) seven of Atthis.**

275. Phanodemos F8 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Leokoreion: Demosthenes (mentions this) in the (speech) *Against Konon* (54.7). **Phanodemos in (book) nine of Atthis says that the Leokoreion was in the middle of the Kerameikos.**

Note: Given the number of the book, Phanodemos is likely to have commented on this monument in connection with the assassination of Hipparkhos (Jacoby, *Text*: 183).

276. Phanodemos F9 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 1.35 p. 20A: **Diopethes the Lokrian, as Phanodemos tells, turned up in Thebes with some bladders full of wine and milk girt under his belt, and, as he was squeezing them, claimed that he was drawing them (i.e. the wine and milk) up from his mouth.**

277. Phanodemos F12 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 11.13 p. 465A: **Phanodemos says that the Athenians, after carrying the new wine from the pithoi to the sanctuary of Dionysos in Limnai, for mixing (sc. with water) for the god, then themselves tasted (it). Whence Dionysos got his name Limnaios, because the new wine, mixed with water, was then for the first time drunk mixed. For this reason also the Nymphs were called the nurses of Dionysos, because the water increased the (quantity of the) wine when it was**

mixed. So, being pleased with the mixture, they used to celebrate Dionysos in their songs, dancing and calling upon him as Euanthes and Dithyrambos and Bakkheutas and Bromios.

Note: Cf. Philokhoros F5a and 5b, #37a and 37b.

278a. Phanodemos F14a/Istros F18 = *Etymologicum Magnum* s.v. Tauropolos: (A name for) Artemis, because she goes around everywhere in the form of a bull (Apollodoros, *FGrHist*: 244 F111), or **because the bull sent by Poseidon against Hippolytos ranged madly over the whole world (Istros F18)**. Or because when Iphigeneia fled to Attika from Skythia, she set up a statue that she called Artemis Tauropolos, since she had come from the race of the Taurians. Some say that when the Greeks were intending to do away with Iphigeneia at Aulis, Artemis gave a doe in exchange. **But according to Phanodemos (it was) a bear**. And according to Nikander (it was) a bull, for which reason the goddess was not called ‘Tauropolos’ but ‘Taurophonos’ (*bull-slayer*).

Note: On this aspect of Artemis (i.e. Tauropolos) see Burkert (1985:152).

278b. Phanodemos F14b = Tzetzes, *Lykophron* 183 p. 91.10 (Scheer): **According to Phanodemos, the writer of history, Artemis took pity (sc. on Iphigeneia) and changed (her) into a bear**, according to Nikander (she changed her into) a bull, according to some into an old woman, according to others into a doe.

279. Phanodemos F15 = Eustathius on Homer, *Iliad* 6.378 p. 648.26 (‘Or has she gone amongst her sisters-in-law...’). (NB Eustathius’ commentary on *galos*, the Homeric word for ‘sister-in-law’, leads to a discussion of the alternative term *daeira*, ‘brother-in-law’, which then prompts a note on the view that Homer and other poets transferred words from divine terminology to human relationships, an example of which is the divine title or name *Daeira*. It continues): That ‘Daeira’ is the name of a divinity is shown by the one who says, ‘Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3 F45) records that Daeira (was the) daughter of Styx and it is likely that that is so. For the ancients assigned Daeira supervision over the ‘wet properties’, wherefore they consider her antipathetic to Demeter. You see, whenever they sacrifice to her, the priestess of Demeter is not present, nor is it acceptable to holy law that she partake of the victims. So, **Phanodemos was wrong in thinking that Daeira was Aphrodite and in claiming that she was the same as Demeter**. Even more wrong are those who....’

280. Phanodemos F17 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Gamelia: Demosthenes (mentions this) in the appeal *Against Euboulides* (57.43, 69) and Isaios (3.76, 79; 8.18). And Didymos the grammarian in his commentary on Isaios says that ‘gamelia’ is the gift given to the *phrateres* at weddings, **citing as evidence the writing of**

Phanodemos, in which there is nothing of the kind. In his observations on Demosthenes the same man (i.e. Didymos) also says that ‘gamelia’ is the introduction of women before the *phrateres*, citing no proof for his explanation.

Note: On the ‘gamelia’ see Lambert (1993:181–5).

281. Phanodemos F18 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Khalkeia: Hypereides (mentions this) in the (speech) *Against Demeas on a charge of usurping citizenship*. The Khalkeia was a festival amongst the Athenians, celebrated <for Athena> on the last day of Pyanepsion, by all craftsmen jointly, but most of all by metalworkers, as Apollonios of Akharnai (*FGrHist*: 365 F3) tells. **But Phanodemos says the festival was not held in honour of Athena, but of Hephaistos.** And there is also a drama (called) Khalkeia written by Menander.

Note: On the Khalkeia see Parke (1977:92–3).

282. Phanodemos F19 = Hesykhios, s.v. Akhanas: Some (say they are) Persian measures, **but Phanodemos (says they are) boxes, into which people going on sacred embassies put their provisions.**

283. Phanodemos F20 = Hesykhios, s.v. Galeoi: Prophets. These lived throughout Sicily. **And (it is) a clan (or a type <of fish>), as Phanodemos and Rhinthon of Taras say.**

284. Phanodemos F21 = Hesykhios, s.v. Tauros (bull): Poseidon (is called) bullish. **And Phanodemos (says that) barley-corns are called a bull, because they have a horn.** Others (use the term ‘bull’ to denote) a pederast, while some (use it for) the private parts of a woman.

Melanthios

285. Melanthios F1 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Grupanion:

Antiphon in the second (book) of *On Truth* (writes), ‘For it (sc. an earthquake) makes the earth burning and compressed into a wrinkled form.’ And Melanthios in (book) two of *Atthis*, recording that an earthquake took place, uses the (following) expression, ‘The earth became wrinkled.’

Philokhoros

286a. Philokhoros F32a = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Aithaia: A city in Lakonia, one of the 100. **Philokhoros (mentions it in (book) three of *Atthis***. The ethnic is Aithean. Thucydides (mentions it in book) one (1.101.2).

286b. Philokhoros F32b = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. *Thea: A city in Lakonia. **Philokhoros (mentions it in book) three**. Theans, as Thucydides.

Note: This entry is probably a corruption of the one above.

287a. Philokhoros F35a = Photios, *Bibliotheka* s.v. Orgeones: Those who are celebrating secret rites to gods that have been established privately... But Seleukos in his *Commentary on the Axones of Solon* says that ‘orgeones’ is the name for those who hold meetings for certain heroes or gods... **Concerning the ‘orgeones’ Philokhoros, too, has written: ‘But the *phrateres* were required to admit both the “orgeones” and the “homogalaktes”, whom we call “gennetai”.’**

287b. Philokhoros F35b = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. gennetai: Those who belong to the same *genos*. For the whole population was divided into parts; the first and largest parts they called ‘tribes’ (*phylai*); each tribe was divided into three, and each part of these was called a *trittus* and a *phratry*. Again, each of the *phratries* was divided into 30 *gene*, from which the priesthoods that belonged to each were selected by lot. The word is found in the works of many of the orators, as, for example, Demosthenes (uses it) in the appeal *Against Euboulides* (57.23, 67). Isaïos in the (speech) *Concerning the inheritance of Apollodoros* (7.1, 13) calls relatives ‘gennetai’. But it was not simply those who were born of the same blood or from the same *genos* that were called relatives, but those who had been distributed originally into the so-called <30> *gene*. **And Philokhoros in the fourth (book) of *Atthis* says that those whom we now call ‘gennetai’ were previously named ‘homogalaktes’.**

Note: In addition to Jacoby’s analysis in *Text* (320–3), the various interpretations of these difficult and controversial fragments and their possible relationship to either Fr. 3 of Aristotle’s *Athenaion Politeia* or to Perikles’ citizenship law of 451/0 and to the administration of the *phratries* of Attika are well discussed by Rhodes (*Commentary*: 66–73) and Lambert (1993:46–9, 74–7). A less traditional approach is

taken by Robertson (1992:32–89).

288. Philokhoros F57 = Scholion RV to Aristophanes, *Frogs* 218 ('the sacred Khytroi'): The Khytroi (*Pots*) was a festival amongst the Athenians... **They hold contests called Khytrinoi there, as Philokhoros says in the sixth (book) of the *Atthides*.**

Note: The Khytroi was the third day of the *Anthesteria*, on which see Parke (1977:116). The Khytrinoi were contests of comedians. See [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* = *Moralia* 841F.

289. Philokhoros F58 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Katatome ('cut down part', 'incision', 'profile/face'): Hypereides (uses the word) in the (speech) *Against Demosthenes*, (where he says), 'And seated below at the rock-face' (Note: See on this Whitehead 2000:392–4). **And Philokhoros in (book) six (writes) as follows: 'Aiskhraios of Anagyrous had a tripod silver-plated and dedicated (it) above the theatre, to celebrate his victory the previous year as chorus-leader for young boys. And he made an inscription on the face of the rock.'**

Note: On Aiskhraios, son of Polykles, of Anagyrous see *APF*: no. 11988.

290. Philokhoros F61 = Scholion to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 835 ('By the sanctuary of Khloe'): **(There was) a sanctuary of Khloe Demeter on the Acropolis, in which the Athenians sacrificed during the month Thargelion, as Philokhoros says in (book) six.**

Note: According to a fragment of Eupolis' *Marikas* (I 309, 183K) a ram was sacrificed to Demeter at this time. Some associate this sacrifice to 'Green' (*Khloe*) Demeter with the *Thargelia* and consider it a pre-harvest ritual (e.g. Parke 1977:149). Jacoby (*Text*, 335) is less confident that we can assign a specific occasion in the month to it.

291. Philokhoros F62 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Phyle: Isokrates (mentions this) in the (speech) *On the Peace* (8.108). Phyle is a deme of the tribe Oineis. Menander in *Dyskolos* (writes): 'Imagine that the place is Phyle in Attika....' **Philokhoros in (book) seven of *Atthis* says that it was a fort.**

Note: The most famous occasion when the fort at Phyle featured in Athenian history was in 404/3, when Thrasyboulos captured it as his first move in the overthrow of the Thirty Tyrants. Unfortunately, the book number does not admit this conclusion here, since book seven covers events after 325/4.

292. Philokhoros F63 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Dispatchers (*apostoleis*): **The men appointed for the dispatching of triremes.** Demosthenes (in the speech) *On behalf of Ktesiphon* (18.107) **and Philokhoros in (book) seven.** Dispatches (*apostoloi*) are the sending out of ships. (That word is used by) the same orator in (the) first of the *Philippics* (4.35).

Note: The *apostoleis* were an extraordinary appointment, for whom see Rhodes 1972:119–20. The best known instances of their activity are (a) in 357/6 in the case *Against Euergos and Mnesiboulos for perjury*, Dem.: 47.18–45 and (b) in 325/4 in *IG*, II²: 1629.242–58 = *Documents*: no. 121; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 100.

293. Philokhoros F68 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 5.15 p. 189C: **Some valleys are called sacred at Athens. Philokhoros mentions them in the ninth.**

294. Philokhoros F71 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. *Hamippoi* (Infantry mixed with cavalry): Isaïos (uses this term) in *Temenikos*. Soldiers campaigning with horses. Some say that some fast-running horses are yoked to each other and the one riding them holds one of the horses beside him and rides on the other. These are called *hamippoi* ('together-horses'). That is how the word is used in Homer (*Iliad*: 15. 684), 'Jumping at one time on one, at another on another.' But the *hamippoi* are infantry, as is clear from the works of Thucydides (5.57.2) and Xenophon in the seventh (7.5.24–5) of the *Hellenika*. And perhaps some mounted scouts (*prodromoi*) are the ones drawn up together with the cavalry. **At any rate Philokhoros in the sixteenth (sixth: Jacoby) says 'also prodromoi'.**

Note: the first explanation put forward is a misunderstanding of the passage in Homer. *Hamippoi* were undoubtedly infantry. The passage from Xenophon shows how they were used by Epameinondas at the battle of Mantinea in 362. They were a feature of the Athenian military probably from that time on, and certainly by the time of Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia* (49.1), where they are distinguished from *prodromoi*. On the latter see Pritchett 1971:130–1.

295. Philokhoros F168 = *Antiatticista* p. 86.20 (Bekker, *Anecdota*) s.v. *Genesia*: **Since there was a publicly-funded festival <at> Athens, (held) on the fifth of Boedromion, called Genesia, as is said by Philokhoros and Solon in the Axones**, and since the usage of the name is Greek, what prevents (one) being appointed to serve over not only the publicly-funded festival, but also each person's private (festival).

Note: For the limited evidence on the festival of the dead called the *Genesia* and speculation on the possibility that Solon's involvement with it was to turn a clan gathering into a state occasion see Jacoby (*Text*: 544–5; *Notes*: 439–40) and Parke (1977:53–4, 178–9), but see Parker (1996:48–9), who calls Jacoby's interpretation 'tendentious' (49 n. 27).

296. Philokhoros F171 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 11.13 p. 464F: **On these topics Philokhoros writes as follows: 'The Athenians used to go to the spectacle at the Dionysiac competitions**

after first wining and dining, and the spectators used to wear crowns on their heads. And throughout the competition wine was poured into their cups and sweetmeats were offered. And wine was poured for the chorus to drink as they were entering and again when they exited after the performance. And Pherekrates the writer of comedy also testifies to this, (saying) that up to his generation the audience was unfed.'

Note: Cf. Phanodemos F12 = #277.

297. Philokhoros F172 = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 14.24 p. 628A: **But Philokhoros says that the ancients do not always sing dithyrambs when they are pouring libations, but whenever they pour libations, they worship Dionysos with wine and drunkenness, but (they worship) Apollo in a quiet and orderly manner.** At any rate, Arkhilokhos says, 'I know how to begin the dithyramb, the beautiful song of lord Dionysos, when my wits have been thunderstruck by wine.' And Epikharmos in *Philoktetes* says, 'You cannot have a dithyramb, if you drink water.'

Note: I have translated the Philokhoros-fragment using the text adopted by Jacoby and most editors of Athenaios. It is, in fact, quite corrupt.

298. Philokhoros F177 = *Etymologicum Magnum* p. 451.40, s.v. Theseion: It is a sanctuary for Theseus, which is a place of asylum for slaves (lawsuits were argued there), or a temple of Theseus, to which runaway slaves fled. **Philokhoros says that of old it was not only slaves who took refuge at the Theseion but also those who were suppliants in any form.**

Note: This fragment may well belong with the section on Theseus the protector of suppliants, #81–4 above. Since, however, Pausanias at book 1.17.6 explicitly associates the building of the Theseion with Kimon's recovery of the bones of Theseus in 476/5, this fragment most likely belongs under that date and is not a part of any portrayal of Theseus in this capacity during his monarchy. But in that case 'of old' must refer retrospectively to a right of sanctuary attached to temple(s) of Theseus before 476/5, of which there were four according to Philokhoros F18a = #78a above.

299. Philokhoros F180 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Peristoikhoi ('rows in a ring'): Demosthenes in the (speech) *Against Nikostratos* (53.15) *concerning the slaves of Arethousios* (says): 'He broke down the plantation of olives in rows (*peristoikhoi*).' But Didymos calls *peristoikhoi* a type of olive tree, **which Philokhoros names stoikhades ('laid out in a row')**. Perhaps the orator (i.e. Demosthenes) has used the name *peristoikhos* for plants growing in rows in a circle around a plot of land.

Note: The term used by Philokhoros is elucidated by a reference in

Pollux, *Onomastikon* 5.36, which suggests that *stoikhades* were olive trees that were somehow distinguished from the sacred olive trees, the so-called *moriai*, maybe because they were planted in rows like an orchard, while the *moriai* were scattered over the countryside separately. If this is the context, the fragment of Philokhoros may refer to the Spartan invasion of Attika at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War and may, therefore, belong with his F125 (= # 144).

300. Philokhoros F184 = Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 3.8.2: For even in Calvus' work Aterianus affirms that one should say, 'Venus is a powerful god' not 'goddess'. Furthermore there is a statue of her on Cyprus that has a beard on its body, though it is dressed in women's clothing, holding a sceptre and with a man's nature. And Aristophanes calls it 'Aphroditon'. And Laevius says the following: 'Therefore worshipping Venus, as a nourisher, whether s/he is a man or a woman, just as she is the nourishing Noctiluca ("she who shines at night", "the moon").' **And Philochorus also in *Atthis* says that the Moon is the same and that men make sacrifice to her dressed as women and women as men, because the same (goddess) is considered both male and female.**

301. Philokhoros F187 = Pollux, *Onomastikon* 10.71: **Philokhoros in the *Atthis* says that an *amphora* was called a *kados* by the ancients, and a half-*amphora* (was called) a half-*kados*.** But Epikharmos in *Philokline* seems to distinguish *kados* from *amphora*, when he says, 'I would not be revealed in either a *kados* or an *amphora*.'

302a. Philokhoros F197a = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Adynatoi ('handicapped'): Aiskhines in the (speech) *Against Timarkhos* (1.103) (mentions them). (They are) those who have less than three minas in property <and> who are maimed physically. These men, after passing a scrutiny at the hands of the *Boule*, used to receive either one obol each day, or two, as Aristotle says in *Athenaion Politeia* (49.4). **According to Philokhoros it was 9 drachmas (= 54 obols) for a month.** There exists also a speech by Lysias *On the Handicapped Person* (speech 24), in which mention is made of (the man) receiving one obol.

302b. Philokhoros F197b = *Synagoge Lex*, (ed. Bekker), p. 345.15, s.v. Adynatoi: People who are maimed in some part of their body so that (they are not able) to do any work, who also were supplied with the necessities of life by the city, the recipients of pay being those possessing a surplus of less than three minas. The *adynatoi* were scrutinized by the *Boule* of 500, and they received one obol for the day, as Lysias says, **but as Philokhoros says, five.** Aristotle said (they received) two (obols a day).

Note: To make sense of the figure ‘5’ claimed for Philokhoros by the *Lexika* and to bring that statement into line with Harpokration’s report, one has to assume the omission of the word ‘drachmas’ and a corruption for the numeral from ‘9’, as is suggested by Jacoby (*Text*: 563). On the institution see Rhodes (*Commentary*: 570–1) and for the speech by Lysias see Harding (1994:202–6). Also relevant in the context of state-support for disadvantaged people is the decree of Theozotides, for which see *Documents*: no. 8.

303. Philokhoros F198 = Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. Antigrapheus (‘copying-clerk’): The man appointed to check off the payments of those who paid money to the state. Demosthenes (refers to him) in the (speech) *Against Androtion* (22.70) as does Aiskhines in the (speech) *Against Ktesiphon* (3.25). There were two types of these copying-clerks, **the one for the administration, as Philokhoros says**, and the one for the *Boule*, as Aristotle (records) in the *Constitution of the Athenians* (54.3–4).

Note: There is clearly some confusion here. The position of *grammateus*, whether of the *Boule* or, after Euboulos, of the Administration, *Dioikesis*, was an important one, held by a citizen. See Rhodes (1972:134–41 and *Commentary*: 599–602). An *antigrapheus*, by contrast, was usually a slave, *demosios*, like the man who certified coinage in the agora and recorded the payment of debts to the state in the presence of the *Boule*, for whom see *Documents*: no. 45; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 2.

304. Philokhoros F199 = *Lexikon rhetoricum Cantabrigense* 346.15: *Eisangelia* (‘impeachment’): (A prosecution) against new and unwritten crimes. Well, that is the opinion of Kaikilos (of Kaleacte). But Theophrastos in the fourth (book) of *On Laws* says it (sc. impeachment) took place: if an orator (tries to) overthrow the (Athenian) People or is bribed to give counsel that is not in the best interests (of the State), or if a person betrays a position (city?) or ships or an infantry army, or if a person defects to the enemy or lives amongst (?) them, or campaigns with them, or takes bribes. Consistent with what (is said) by Theophrastos on the subject is (what we learn about) the impeachment of Themistokles from Krateros (*FGrHist*: 342 F11), the impeachment that was brought by Leobotes, son of Alkmaion, from Agryle. Some of the orators were in the habit of using the term ‘*eisangelia*’ for crimes of a less than major category. And sometimes, *after denouncing those who were being falsely accused, they brought impeachments, **before a jury of 1,000, according to Philokhoros**, of 1,500, as Demetrios of Phaleron (*FGrHist*: 228 F12) (says).

Note: Unfortunately, the text following the asterisk is corrupt, so it is not clear how much we should ascribe to Philokhoros beyond the

number of jurymen in an impeachment trial. In fact, the whole lexical entry is garbled. The information on the bases for impeachment under the *nomos eisangeltikos* ascribed to Theophrastos is, however, reliable, since it is confirmed by Hypereides, *For Euxenippos*: 7–8 (on which see Whitehead 2000:163, 186–9 and Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 8.52). For a general treatment of the law of impeachment see MacDowell (1978:183–6, 198–201) and for specific cases see Hansen (1975).

305. Philokhoros F201 = Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Krepis: **A place in Athens. So (says) Philokhoros.**

306. Philokhoros F204 = Scholion V to Aristophanes, *Peace* 242 ('O Prasiai, thrice-afflicted'): Prasiai (was) a city in Lakonia... **There is also a sea-port in Attika (i.e. called Prasiai), as Thucydides says (8.95.1) and Philokhoros.**

307. Philokhoros F205 = Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnika* s.v. Xypete: A deme of the tribe Kekropis. The demesman is a Xypetaian...the local designation is 'from Xypetaion'. **Philokhoros says the deme (was) Xypetaionon, with the first 'o' long (omega) and omicron at the end.**

Appendix 2

NOTES ON KEKROPS

#7 (Philokhoros F93): The earliest references to and depictions of Kekrops in literature and art (Arist. *Wasps*: 438; Eurip. *Ion*: 1163–4; and for the art see Kron 1976:90f. and figs 1, 4, 10, 11) represent him as a bi-form character, half-man, half-snake. This was the traditional, mythical view of him and conformed very well with the concept that he was earth-born. But this explanation of his nickname (*diphyes*) was hardly suited to a rational historian's mind. Jacoby (*Text*: 390–2) is probably correct in arguing that the only part of this composite citation from Synkellos (Eusebios) that derives from Philokhoros is the sentence explaining Kekrops' nickname on the basis either of his size or his bilingual ability. Both explanations make him quite human and the idea that he was Egyptian suggests that Philokhoros did not subscribe to the belief that he was autochthonous. In the absence of any fragment on this issue from any other Atthidographer, however, it is not possible to say whether Philokhoros was the originator of these explanations or whether he inherited them from a predecessor. As we shall see from other fragments, rationalizing myth was a common trait amongst the Atthidographers and I suspect that these explanations were well established by Philokhoros' time. They were not the only ones (cf., especially, the *Souda* s.v. Kekrops; schol. Arist. *Plutos*: 773 and see Jacoby, *Text*: 390–1), not least of which was the notion that he was called 'two-natured' as a result of his legislation on monogamy, because after that people recognized they came from two natures – the male and the female (see below under F96).

#8 (Philokhoros F94): From probably as early as the end of the sixth century (or, at least, by the time of Kimon) Athenians began to view the *synoikismos* of Attika by Theseus as a defining event in their history. Whether it was only a political unification (Thuc: 2.15.2), or involved a physical removal of people to the city of Athens (Plut. *Theseus*: 25.1), it was the justification for the primacy of Athens as the administrative centre for all Attika. It is regarded as a distinctive achievement for Athens by modern scholars also, though they disagree with Athenian tradition about when and how it happened (see [Chapter 3](#)). But it follows that such a concept, once created, would require a corresponding vision of the state of Attika before unification. This vision was traced back to Kekrops (Thuc: 2.15.1), to whom was

attributed (as here) the foundation of the first fortified settlements of Attika for protection of the people against attack. It is not improbable (*pace* Jacoby, *Notes*: 289) that Hellanikos was the creator of this vision and the source for Thucydides.

Whether he also assigned these settlements the number 12 is, perhaps, less certain, though that number had been used by at least one Atthidographer before the time of Philokhoros, as can be seen from its prior appearance in *MP* epoch 20: **‘From the time when Thes[eus, as king] of Athens unified the twelve cities into one...’**. This number is usually believed to be fictional, perhaps modelled on the well-known 12 cities of Ionia (Herod: 1.142–5; *MP*, epoch 27), of which Athens claimed to be the metropolis (Busolt 1893–1904:2.82; Jacoby, *Text*: 393–4; Parker 1996:12, n. 9). Furthermore, there are other problems with the names: there are only eleven in the text of Strabo and the twelfth (**Tetrakomoi**) has been restored. But the alternatives are not persuasive and the restoration is defensible (see Jacoby, *Text*: 392–3; *Notes*: 287–9). More troublesome is the name **Kekropia**. Not only is this not a name of any community in Attika at any time, it is the name given by the Atthidographic source of *MP* to the whole region of Attika (*MP*, epoch 1). But Jacoby may be right in thinking that Philokhoros was using this name to signify Athens itself (*Text*: 397–9). How original he might have been in doing this (i.e. whether the view in *MP* represented the united opinion of all his predecessors or not), we are unable to say.

These problems are compounded by the fact that it has not gone unnoticed that the number 12 is also relevant to other institutions of Athenian administration, not least the 12 trittyes of the pre-Kleisthenic state (Arist. *Ath. Pol.*: 21.3), several of which have names identical to some of the cities listed here (i.e. Epakria, Thorikos, Sphettos, Eleusis, Tetropolis and, probably, Aphidna). This similarity led Hommel (1940:181–200) to suggest that these were what Philokhoros was referring to, but his argument is not compelling (cf. Jacoby, *Text*: 394). Even less so is Robertson’s theory (1992:67–70), based upon the identification of trittyes with phratries in *Ath. Pol.*: fr. 3, that it is the phratries of early Attika that Philokhoros is talking about (cf. Lambert 1993:371–80).

Despite these doubts, however, it should be noted that several of the communities named here were very real and are known to have existed in Bronze and Dark Age Attika (e.g. Brauron, Aphidna, Eleusis, Thorikos and the Marathonian Tetropolis). Thus, if this knowledge was not handed down by tradition, the Atthidographers made some very good deductions (or guesses).

Finally, a word needs to be said about the enemies of Attika named in this fragment. The Karians are familiar from Thucydides (1.8) in the

role of plundering pirates, who attacked mainland Greece from their bases in the islands until they were eradicated by Minos. As for the pre-Greek Aones, on whom see Hekataios (*FGrHist*: 1 F119), by defining them as Boiotians Philokhoros has identified them with Athens' long-time, traditional enemies. But that hostility, which began in the late-sixth century, had ended on the field of Khaironeia and been obliterated by Alexander's ruthless destruction of Thebes in 335. So it was a dead letter in Philokhoros' day. He surely inherited this biased view from one of his fourth-century predecessors, who may well have been Androktion. Thus, we are given here a glimpse of the blend of traditional material and learned speculation viewed through the lens of Athenian parochial concerns that characterizes the content of the *Atthis*.

#9 (Philokhoros F95): Essential to an understanding of this cryptic citation is (1) that it was prompted by a reference in Pindar to the story of Deukalion and Pyrrha's creation of a race of people from the stones (or bones) of the earth and (2) that there is a pun in Greek between the word for 'people' (*laoi*, with the stress on the last syllable) and an alternative form (*laos*, stress on the first syllable) of the word for 'stone' (*laas*). It appears that the scholion took Philokhoros to be disputing the attribution of the usage to Deukalion. In doing this, Philokhoros was no doubt following those of his predecessors who claimed that Deukalion lived later in time than Kekrops and took refuge with Kranaos in Athens (cf. *MP*, epoch 4). This would surely not include the non-Athenian Hellanikos, the author of the *Deukalionieia*. Jacoby might be correct to suspect Phanodemos as the originator of the idea (*Text*: 400). The distortion is clearly an instance of Athenian propaganda pre-empting the role of the universally recognized father of the Hellenic race to advance its own claims to autochthony. At the same time, the tradition has been rationalized. In place of stones literally making people, the stones that were brought by the people, when counted, make the number of people. Thus Kekrops can be credited with employing a primitive form of census, though precisely how he used this to increase the number of Athenians is not clear, unless he was at the same time being credited with a primitive form of political corruption! The number 20,000 is, of course, based upon no evidence. If it was presumed to include an equal number of women, then the figure for men in Kekrops' time would become 10,000, which is rather close to the 10,800 for the male citizen-body imagined in the schematic arrangement of *Ath. Pol.*: fr. 3 (cf. Jacoby, *Text*: 400; Lambert 1993:379–80). But, given the precise mathematical basis of the number 10,800, the closeness of the numerals may mean nothing.

#10 (Philokhoros F96): This fragment of Herakleides Lembos'

Epitome of Hermippos of Smyrna's *On Lawgivers* has recently been edited with commentary by Bollansée (in *FGrHist*: 4a.3:16–18, 121–4). It is not clear what to make of it. To be sure Kekrops was known in antiquity, at least by the time of Aristotle's pupil Klearkhos, as the originator of such a basic social practice as monogamous marriage (Athen. *Deipn.*: 13.2 p. 555D), and later authors attribute to him the invention of writing (Tacitus, *Annals*: 11.14), the yoking of horses (Nonnos, *Dionys.*: 41, 383–4) and burial (Cic. *Leg.*: 2.25, 63). While none of these are laws, Hermippos in the late third century clearly considered him a 'lawgiver' and set him at the head of what was probably a list of Athenian lawgivers. Unfortunately, it is not clear where or how Philokhoros was involved. In fact, Jacoby (*Text*: 401) was of the opinion that Philokhoros was being cited, not for Kekrops, but for the man mentioned just below, Bouzyges ('ox-yoker'), who was the first man to yoke an ox to the plough, a lawgiver, first priest of Zeus Teleios and eponym of the priestly *genos* Bouzygai (see Kearns 1989:152). However, in this he was certainly wrong, as Bollansée has shown (*FGrHist*: 4a.3:124), because he failed to take account of the fact that there was a *lacuna* of 28 lines separating Philokhoros from Bouzyges. It is better to conclude that Philokhoros was being cited in regard to Kekrops (and maybe also for Bouzyges), but it is not clear in what way. The particle DE, which introduces Philokhoros' name, is usually adversative and would most naturally be taken to indicate that he disagreed in some respect with what preceded, but since we do not know what that was, we are in no position to decide. The most we can conclude is that Philokhoros made some reference to Kekrops' law-making, even if it was only to deny it.

#11 (Philokhoros F97): In addition to being cast in the role of first king and first legislator, Kekrops was also considered to have introduced some important features of Athenian religion and cult. As Jacoby has well shown, however (*Text*: 389–90, 401–4), Philokhoros (unlike the possibly Attidographic source of the last part of #7 = F93) was careful not to associate the first king with introduction of any of the more important cults of the state (i.e. those for Athena or Zeus), and especially not any that involved animal sacrifice. Kekrops was supposed to be the king of an agrarian people in the first stage of settled community life, so agrarian gods like Kronos and Rhea, who were worshipped with bloodless sacrifice, were appropriate for him. A corrupt (because it names Zeus) reflection of this can be found, perhaps, in Pausanias' statement that Kekrops established the cult of Zeus Hypatos and offered to him barbecued oatcakes rather than sacrificed animals (Paus. 8.2.3). On the question whether the 'pro' before Jupiter is to be translated as 'before' (time), 'in front of' (place) or 'in place of' see Jacoby's exhaustive disquisition (*Text*: 402–3).

The festival that is referred to by Macrobius was the *Kronia*, which took place on 12 Hekatombaion (see Parke 1977:29–30; Burkert 1985:231–2). It was the first festival of the New Year (about mid-summer) and surely celebrated the gathering of the harvest. Learned Romans, like Accius, equated this Greek festival with the *Saturnalia* (Macrobius, *Saturnalia*: 1.7.36), because of the similar way in which slaves and masters dined together, though Philokhoros does not mention the role-reversal (masters serving slaves) that was supposedly part of the Roman tradition.

#12 (Philokhoros F98): Given the characterization that Philokhoros has apparently been imposing upon Kekrops, it is not surprising that (a) in his time the Athenians should have been armed for their protection and (b) that the weapons they were armed with should have been made of wild animal hide and not that of the domesticated ox, which they only began to use *later*, after its sacrifice had been introduced in the worship of Zeus Polieus (cf. Androtion F16 = #250 on the ritual of the *Bouphonia*).

Appendix 3

NOTES ON PELASGIANS

#13 (Hellanikos, *FGrHist*: 4 F4): Under Jacoby's scheme, some authors are entered in more than one category. Hellanikos is one such author. He is listed as no. 4 in the category *Genealogy and Mythography* and no. 323a in the volume on *Horography and Ethnography*. Strictly speaking, therefore, this fragment from his *Phoronis* (the myth of Phoroneus, founder of Argos) does not belong in this collection, but, in effect, it can be taken to represent the essence of his belief about the Pelasgians, uncontaminated by Athenian attitudes. Though he might have embellished his account somewhat under Athenian influence, when he wrote his *Atthis*, he is not likely to have changed his basic concept. So, we can see here that Hellanikos represented the Pelasgians as separate from the Hellenes, by whom they were expelled from Greece. Whether he thought they were there before the Hellenes, we cannot tell. Interestingly, he has them flee (by ship; they were seafaring people) westward to the east coast of Italy, to Kroton (Cortona) on the river Spina (on which see Briquel 1984:3–30), a tradition that was adopted by several Roman authors (see the detailed discussion of the tradition by Dionysios of Halikarnassos in *Ant. Rom.* 1.17–30; for other beliefs about the diaspora of the Pelasgians see Sourvinou-Inwood 2003:107–21). Hellanikos' association of them with the Tyrrhenians (Etruscans), which he may have inherited from Hekataios (Briquel 1984:110–11, 221; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003:106, n. 14), re-appears in Thucydides (4.109.4) and is an important element in the account of later Atthidographers, as can be seen from the fragments of Philokhoros. Whether he believed they returned eastward later we cannot tell, but it is interesting to note what has happened to the story by the time of Myrsilos of Methymna, who wrote in the mid-third century about the same time as Philokhoros. He preserves the connection with the Tyrrhenians, but reverses the process; his Tyrrhenians leave their homeland (presumably Etruria) and attack Greece, *en route* changing their name to Pelargoi (not Pelasgi), because they arrived in flocks, like birds.

#14 (Kleidemos F16): Although we do not have any indication where or in what context Kleidemos made the comment quoted here, Jacoby (*Text*: 73) maintains that the Pelasgians must be the subject, since the most probable reference is to the building of the 'Pelagic'

wall. His opinion is generally accepted. The idea of levelling the acropolis in preparation for building the wall is rather sophisticated for the construction of the Mykenaian (Kyklopean) wall and may well be an anachronistic concept, borrowed by Kleidemos from his knowledge of the work done to the surface of the acropolis for the later fifth-century building programme. He is the only author to state that the acropolis wall had nine-gates.

The spelling of the name becomes an issue here, too. Jacoby (*Text*: 73) is at his most confusing on this. He claims categorically that Kleidemos used the spelling 'Pelargikon' for the whole wall 'like Herodotos in 5.64', contradicting his own rejection of that reading in Herodotos: 5.64 (he incorrectly says 5.94) as 'incomprehensible' (*Notes*: 74 at F16 n. 10). Furthermore, his assertion that the *Synagoge* has the correct spelling against the testimony of the *Souda* (which has 'Pelasgikon') is arbitrary and his claim that 'His (sc. Kleidemos)' name for it (sc. the wall) is Pelargikon, as in the official use and in earlier Athenian authors' is simply wrong. The official use he refers to is the inscription *IG*, I³: 78, which specifically deals with the consecrated land, not the wall, and the authors he cites are Aristophanes, *Birds*: 832 (discussed above, p. 26), Thucydides 2.17.1, who makes a point of stating that the Pelargikon is *below* the acropolis, and Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*: 19.5, which was written after Kleidemos' *Atthis*. This only goes to show how confused and confusing the tradition about this issue is.

#15–17 (Philokhoros F99–101): These fragments together represent the most complete Attidographic narrative about the Pelasgians. **F99** reveals that Philokhoros had adopted the bird image for the Pelasgians (Pelargians), explaining it, in a typically rationalizing manner, by the time of their arrival (they sailed in, when the sailing season opened in spring, like migratory birds) and the visual aspect they presented (their sails were like wings).

F100 shows close affinities to the account given by Herodotos (6.137–40), but there are differences. Philokhoros, it appears, did not derive his material from Herodotos. In the first place, he follows Hellanikos in emphasising the association of Pelasgian with Tyrrhenian (Etruscan). In fact, in this fragment he only uses the latter name, but **F101** shows that he associated the two names. This is an element not found in Herodotos' version. It looks as though his vision was rather like that of Myrsilos, i.e. that they originated west of Greece and moved eastward, staying for a time in Athens, then, after they were expelled from there, moving to Lemnos, where they got the name Sintians (on whom see de Simone 1996:43–4, 73–4), because of their harmful ways (**F101**). All Greeks enjoyed playing with etymology, especially to explain a significant name, and the

Atthidographers were no exception. Where he thought they went after Miltiades drove them from Lemnos, we do not know.

Second, while Herodotos' Athenian source denies that any Pelasgians were killed during their expulsion, Philokhoros has received an account that admits that many were. This shows that the two stories (sc. about the wall-building and about the attack on Brauron) were joined into one narrative in some other version than Herodotos', thus demonstrating that he was not the only author to link them and maybe not the first, either.

A third difference between the two is the way the stories are arranged. Herodotos starts with Miltiades and flashes backwards to the Pelasgians, while Philokhoros takes the opposite approach. With the phrase 'some time later' he looks ahead to the raid on Brauron. Historiographically, this reveals an interesting feature of his style, which we have seen before already in **#8 (F94)** and **#12 (F98)**; that is, the habit of comparing or continuing the account he is giving with some later event or practice. This is a feature that is somewhat unexpected from the writer of a chronicle, since the reference to the event in Brauron is quite out of place chronologically at this point. We cannot tell how, or even if, he referred to this incident again at its appropriate place, whenever that was, nor whether he correlated it with the career of Miltiades.

The incident at Brauron deserves some comment of its own. Brauron was listed amongst the original 12 settlements of Kekrops (**#8**). The archaeological record has verified that a community existed there in the later Bronze Age. Like most of Attika (with the exception of Athens), it experienced depopulation in the sub-Mykenaian period. Though there may be some indications of pottery at Brauron from the Proto-Geometric period, the first clear signs of religious activity come from the end of the eighth century. The sanctuary was dedicated to the worship of Artemis. A temple was eventually built there by Peisistratos in the second half of the sixth century (Photios, *Lexikon* s.v. Brauronia; cf. Parker 1996:74, n. 27). The shrine to Artemis Brauronia on the Acropolis at Athens is usually dated to the same period (Travlos 1971:124–6).

The worship of Artemis at Brauron (and also probably at Mounykhia) involved a distinctive ritual, in which selected young maidens, aged between 5 and 10, 'played the bear (arktos) for Artemis' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*: 644–5). The exact form of this ritual is unclear and its significance (initiatory or propitiatory) is in dispute (see, for example, Parke 1977:137–40; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988:111–17; Faraone 2003:43–68).

Appendix 4

NOTES ON THE DAUGHTERS OF KEKROPS

I have discussed the three Kekropidai elsewhere (*Androton*: 78–83), so will keep my comments here to a minimum. The Kekropidai present an excellent example of the problems faced by the Atthidographers and, at the same time, of the methods they used in solving them. Originally, they were almost certainly of independent origin, probably divine (at least, Agraulos/Aglauros and Pandrosos had their own shrines, and Herse was celebrated in procession according to Ister), and had their own narratives; but by early in the fifth century (at the latest) they had become associated as a unit with Kekrops in one of the most important stories of the Athenian tradition, the birth of Erikhthonios (see the commentary on #19–27 and also the discussion under *Kekrops*), and thereby had become a way of linking the two kings. Beyond this, the Kekropidai, individually, play the roles selected for female characters from myth, that of genealogical glue as mothers, wives and daughters (as e.g. the *Ehoiai*) for the elaborate constructs of the mythographers (West 1985:137–71), and as a source, to which many important families of historical times traced their origin.

So, for example, Agraulos/Aglauros was made the mother of Alkippe by Ares in **Hellanikos F1 (#19)** and thus connected to the foundation myth for the Areiopagos (see [Appendix 6](#) below), and Pandrosos is named the mother of Keryx by Hermes in **Androton F1 (#20)**. In that capacity, she was progenitrix of the fictitious eponym of one of the most significant *gene* in classical Athens, the Kerykes, who held ancestral associations with the Eleusinian Mysteries (*Androton*: 82–3). Also Herse, though none of these fragments record this, was reputed to be the mother (by Hermes) of Kephalos, and through him eventually ancestress of Adonis (Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.13.3). The story of the liaison between Hermes and Herse is told most famously by Ovid (*Metam.* 2.708–833), in whose account Aglauros also appears, playing an obstructive role for which she is turned into a stone. As will be seen below, that version of Aglauros/Agraulos' fate is in total disagreement with the rest of the tradition.

In religion the three girls were worshipped separately. Pandrosos

(‘all-dewy’) had her own precinct on the acropolis in the Erekhtheion – the Pandroseion, in which was located the tomb of Kekrops and the sacred olive tree of Athena. She had her own priestess (*SEG*: 39 no. 218; cf. Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 10.191). This is a clear sign that she was a divinity in her own right. Her connection with the oldest cult associations of Athens is strong. So is her closeness to Athena (e.g. **Philokhoros F10, #21**; cf. Brulé 1987:34–8, espec. 35–6). That she was eventually transformed into an epithet of Athena (Athena Pandrosos) should cause no surprise.

Aglauros (‘bright one’) or Agraulos (‘she of the fields’) has a similar history. [NB The two spellings have come down to us from antiquity, though the Attidographers employ only the latter, see *Androtion*: 79–80, in defiance of the epigraphic evidence, which uses Aglauros exclusively. They are probably simply the result of metathesis of the letters ‘r’ and ‘l’, though see Brulé 1987:28–34 for the view that they represent two aspects of the divinity’s function – mother and maiden]. She, too, though originally independent, was subsumed by Athena. Philokhoros even rationalized her into a priestess of Athena (**F106 = #23**), and later tradition made her the first to hold that position (Hesychius s.v. Aglauros; Photios, *Bibliotheka* s.v. Kallynteria and Plynteria). She was involved with Athena Polias in the two cleansing festivals of the Kallynteria and Plynteria, and her death in the Erikhthonios-story was used to explain why the cult-statue’s clothing was left unwashed for the remainder of the year (Parke 1977:152–5; Burkert 1985:229–33; *Androtion*: 80). In fact, she had her own priestess. An inscription (*IG*, II²: 3459) of the early third century (during Philokhoros’ lifetime) names Pheidistrate, daughter of Eteokles of Aithalidai, as priestess of Aglauros (sic). Recently, another inscription from 247/6 or 246/5 has come to light, which honours Timokrite, daughter of Polynikos of Aphidna, for her piety as priestess of Aglauros (Dontas 1983:52–5). Another document interestingly associates the priestess of Aglauros with the worship of Pandrosos and Kourotrophos (Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 37, line 12; cf. Parker 1996:311).

Aglauros also had her own sanctuary in a cave (Paus.: 1.18.2), on the east slope of the Acropolis (Dontas 1983:57–63), where young ephebes in classical times swore their oath of loyalty (Dem.: 19. 303 with scholion; Plutarch, *Alkibiades*: 15.7; Pollux, *Onomastikon*: 8.105. Cf. *Documents*: no. 109; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 88). Her significance for the citizens of the fifth and fourth century (at least) was as a role-model for young soldiers, who might have to die for their country (the claim by **Bion of Prokonnesos [FGrHist: 332 F1 = #27]**, that women honoured and took oaths by Aglauros is otherwise unsubstantiated). This role was connected to the tradition that she had

sacrificed herself for the city by throwing herself from the acropolis during the war between Athens and Eleusis (**Philokhoros F105 = #22**). Unfortunately, this war belongs to the narrative related to the reign of Erekhtheus, who was the sixth king in the Atthidographic scheme and who was assigned dates more than 100 years after Kekrops by the chronographers. It will be more appropriate to discuss that story under his reign. But Aglauros/Agraulos was, it seems, in the habit of throwing herself from the acropolis, since she was believed to have done just that after breaking her promise to Athena and looking into the basket, which held the infant Erikhthonios. As mentioned above, it is in that story that she becomes one of the daughters of Kekrops.

The third member of the trio is Herse ('dew'). As the fragment from **Istros** shows (**#25**), some ancient etymologies connected her with the obscure festival of the *Arrhēphoria*, by changing the spelling to *Hersephoria* (a full review of the etymological alternatives for the name of this festival is provided by Brulé 1987:80–1. Cf. Donnay 1997:178–9). Some modern scholars have followed along this path and claimed for Herse an ancient association with the Acropolis (e.g. Burkert 1985:229). But the evidence for Herse is weak. In fact, the *Arrhēphoria* was a festival in honour of Athena Polias, as is shown by several late dedications from the Acropolis (e.g. *IG*, II²: 3472, 3488, 3515, 3554, 3555, 3556), probably in conjunction with Pandrosos (*IG*, II²: 3472, 3515. Cf. Paus.: 1.27.3–4). Jacoby (*Text*: 425; *Notes*: 327) is more likely correct in the view that Herse was not an independent deity, in Athens at any rate, and may even belong elsewhere (she is part of a complex of myths that are located in the eastern Mediterranean). She was probably the last to be co-opted into the Kekropidai, since there are indications that a version of the story involved only two daughters, Pandrosos and Aglauros (see e.g. **Amelesagoras #26**). Precisely when she joined the two local divinities to form that tri-partite unit is uncertain (Brulé 1987:38), but probably by the first quarter of the fifth century.

More importantly, while Herse is the name for the third Kekropid in our literary sources that derive ultimately from the Atthidographic tradition, she does not appear in the epigraphic evidence. Pandrosos and Aglauros (the spelling of her name in inscriptions) do, however, appear together in both sacrificial calendars and ephebic documents (see e.g. the decree of the Salaminioi, Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 37.12). Whenever they do, they are associated with Athena Polias. Often they are accompanied by another goddess, Kourotrophos (for the evidence see Brulé 1987:38–43). The situation is the same in regard to the *deipnophoria* at the festival of Athena Skiras, where the literary tradition has Herse (**#24**) the epigraphic evidence names

Kourotrophos (Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 37.39–52). This has led some scholars to equate Herse with Kourotrophos (Ge), even assigning her the cave on the north slope of the acropolis (for which see Travlos 1971:72, 228) that used to be called the Aglaureion (Pirenne-Delforge 1994:57; Donnay 1997:196, 199). The purpose behind this is to find some way of associating the myth of the Kekropidai and the birth of Erikhthonios with the festival (or ritual) known as the *Arrhephoria*.

The best account of this obscure ritual is provided by Pausanias (1.27.3). *Two young virgins* (as young as 7 years old according to Aristophanes, *Lys.*: 641–2) *spend a year in isolation on the Acropolis in preparation for the moment when, on the second or third of Skiophorion* (the last month of the Attic year), *they perform a special nighttime ritual for Athena Polias. They are given by the priestess of Athena something to carry on their heads, but neither she nor they know what it is. They carry this (these things?) to an enclosed place near ‘Aphrodite in the Gardens’, where they find an entrance to an underground passage. They go down this passage, deposit their burden, pick up another in its place and return with that to the priestess. Then they are freed from their service and can return to normal life.*

Hardly anything about this festival (or ritual) is agreed upon. After all, it is only part of the story. The two young girls had two companions. All four, or just the two selected for the nighttime performance, also had the responsibility of beginning the process of weaving the *peplos* for Athena Parthenos during their year on the acropolis. This combination of duties may be illustrated in a scene on the east frieze of the Parthenon (Dillon 2002:46–7). Disagreement exists over the significance of the name, *arrhephoria*. Does it mean ‘bearing of secret things’, ‘bearing of the dew’, or ‘basket-bearing’? What did the girls carry down (cakes or snakes, or cakes made like snakes, or phalloi) and what did they bring back (dew, a snake or a rock)? Where did all this take place? The recent demonstration by Dontas of the real location of the sanctuary of Aglauros has shattered long-held views on the topography of the ceremony. And, finally, most recently the debate has focussed on the meaning of the performance to the religious life of the *polis*. Was it a festival or a ritual and what did it mean for the young women involved (i.e. was it some sort of sexual initiation rite)? The bibliography is long and growing. See, especially, Burkert 1966:1–25; Robertson 1983:241–88; van Sichelen 1987:88–102; Brulé 1987:13–175; Pirenne-Delforge 1994:48–63; Donnay 1997:177–205; Dillon 2002:46–8, 57–60; Graf 2003:3–25.

Appendix 5

NOTES ON ERYSIKHTHON

Given what has been said in the commentary to #28, we can see here a typical example of the way a genealogist (chronicler, chronographer) worked in antiquity. In composing a king-list for a central administration, like Athens, where none existed, he (Hellanikos?) took names of cult or family heroes from smaller, outlying communities and bound them together by a number of simple devices. We have seen above in the case of the Kekropidai how female cult-figures could be turned into daughters to create links (and similarly Agrauros/Aglauros, their supposed mother and wife of Kekrops, was made into a daughter of Aktaios). So, here, a local cult hero from Prasiai is made into a son of the reigning Athenian king, his lack of connection to whom is shown by the tradition that he had no children and, therefore, marked the end of the line. This was a useful way of incorporating him into the list without any consequences.

More interesting in the case of this specific citation from Phanodemos is its possible relevance to events contemporary with his own time. The fact that it is Phanodemos, not Philokhoros, who is cited may not be a matter of chance. It suggests that he may have been particularly associated with information on Erysikthton and Delos and, indeed, such a connection has not been hard to find. In the latter half of the 340s (more precisely, between 345 and 343, see Engels 1989:74–80), Athenian control of the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos came into dispute and the Delians appealed to the Delphic Amphiktyony for a decision. The Athenians took the situation seriously, since Philip II of Makedon and his supporters now controlled the Council, and selected one of their most experienced negotiators, Aiskhines, to represent them. But, before the case was heard, the balance of power in Athenian politics shifted and Aiskhines was relieved of the commission by the Areiopagos (Dem.: 19.134; cf. Wankel 1976:727–30) and replaced by Hypereides, a strong opponent of Makedon.

His great Delian oration ([Plut.] *Moralia* 850A), which surely won the debate for Athens, has unfortunately only survived for us in fragments and in reports from ancient scholars of rhetoric. According to one of the latter, Hypereides delved back into the mythical past in order to substantiate Athens' ancient claim to the sanctuary. One

fragment (F67 Jensen) gives an idea what this means. Using a simplistic play on words, Hypereides argued that it was at a place in Attika called Zoster (= *zone*, ‘girdle’) that Leto had loosed her girdle in preparation for giving birth and that it was Athena of Forethought (*Athena Pronoia*), coming from her sanctuary at Prasiai, who had guided her thence to Delos. Thus the very birth of Artemis and Apollo was put under Athena’s patronage (Parker 1996:223–7).

This was probably not the only place where Hypereides ‘stretched’ the facts to suit his case. But he may not have been alone. A younger member of the same political group was Phanodemos, author of our fragment, to whom on this matter Jacoby attributes ‘an invention perhaps even more unscrupulous than the Zoster legend’ (*Text*: 176–7). He is referring to a not-too-subtle alteration between the reports given by Herodotos and Pausanias of the supposed route of offerings sent from the Hyperboreans (mythical hosts of Apollo) to Delos. Herodotos (4.1–2) traces the route in detail from northern Europe, via the Adriatic, to Dodona, Euboea, Karystos, Tenos and, finally, Delos. Pausanias (1.31.2), on the other hand (or rather his source, since Pausanias does not create original material), gives a quite different route, in which the offerings are passed from the Hyperboreans to the Arimaspians, from the Arimaspians to the Issedones and thence to Sinope, which lies on the south coast of the Black Sea. From there, they are brought to Prasiai. The Athenians then carry them over to Delos.

These are, of course, two distinct routes, one from the west, the other from the east, and, since the Hyperboreans were imagined as inhabiting a very large space across the north, it would not be impossible to suggest that they described two separate delegations that were independent of each other, if it were not that the route given by Pausanias very clearly served Athenian interest. By showing the offerings passing through Attika and being transported by Athenians, it supported the claim that Athens had administered the sanctuary from legendary times. Furthermore, Pausanias’ route is given in the context of his discussion of Prasiai and the Erysikhthon story, which he probably found in the same source. The evidence is, of course, only circumstantial that Phanodemos is the author of this later version (or intermediary, since he could have found it in Hypereides’ speech), but his demonstrably Atheno-centric bias, which will become more apparent in later fragments, inclines one to accept Jacoby’s interpretation. The possibility would become almost a certainty, if we could be sure that Phanodemos actually claimed that an Athenian, called Hyperboreas, was the eponym of the race (*FGrHist*: 325 F29), but that depends on accepting that his name is correctly restored in a scholion to Pindar, *Olympian*: 3.28 (Snell), which says: **The**

**Hyperboreans were named after a certain Athenian, Hyperboreas,
as Ph(ano)demos (says).**

Appendix 6

NOTES ON AREIOPAGOS

#29–31 (Hellānikos F1, F22a–b/Philokhoros F3): These fragments make it quite clear that from the first Atthidographer to the last the trial of Ares over the killing of Halirrhothios was considered the founding myth for the Areiopagos. Furthermore, even though we only have the explicit testimony of Hellānikos for all four mythical trials, of Ares, Kephalos, Daidalos and Orestes, we do have the reference in Istros (**#35**) to the trial of Kephalos and it is hardly likely that the remaining Atthidographers did not also report them. Questions remain, however, about when and how these homicides were associated as trials before the Areiopagos and to what extent Hellānikos himself was responsible.

The first of the four for which we have any testimony in extant literature or art is the last and the most famous, namely the trial of Orestes. Aiskhylos' play, *Eumenides*, was produced in 458 BC. Its theme is the pursuit and trial of Orestes. Though the myth was old and had been told in several versions before (see the review in Podlecki 1989:2–6), Aiskhylos was the first author known to have located the trial in Athens and have Orestes and the Erinyes argue their case before a jury of Areiopagites, whose equivocal vote required that Athena cast the deciding ballot for acquittal. The well-known conclusion saw the avenging Furies become identified with the kindly (*eumenideis*) August Goddesses (*Semnai Theai*), whose home in a cleft in the rocks of the Areios Pagos was a landmark of Aiskhylean Athens.

But the location was not the only respect in which Aiskhylos' treatment was purposefully new. Provocatively, when she calls for the jury to vote (v. 681ff.), Athena tells them that they are judging the *first case of homicide*, and that thereafter the court of the Areiopagos would exist forever. Thus, in the *Eumenides* the trial of Orestes becomes the founding myth of the Areiopagos. Further, Athena goes on to explain the etymology of the name, Areios Pagos, by the seemingly original story (seemingly, because it disagrees with the etymology offered by Hellānikos and generally accepted, though see Wallace 1985:213–14) that, when the Amazons invaded Attika in the time of Theseus, *they had camped on the hill and had sacrificed to Ares there*. All this prompted Jacoby (*Text*: 22–5; *Notes*: 19–29) to protest that Aiskhylos

was re-writing established Athenian tradition for his own dramatic (and probably political, following the reforms of Ephialtes) purposes. Jacoby detected a conscious rejection of what he felt was the existing foundation myth for the court and the name of the hill, namely the trial of Ares by Poseidon. Such was the power of the drama in his opinion, however, that Hellanikos had no recourse but to accept the new story. Nevertheless, he made sure to place it last, not first, and so to validate the older tradition. Further, he discarded Aiskhylos' Erinyes and returned to the earlier concept that the prosecutors were human, in his case a group from Lakedaimon (#30a).

Now, all this sounds very reasonable and may well be correct. It is, as far as I can tell, universally accepted. Nevertheless, some contrary points should be noted. If Jacoby is correct in his belief (*Text*: 42–3) that Hellanikos F22a (#30a) is taken from the work on the *Priestesses of Argos*, and I suspect he is because of the reckoning by generations, and if he is also correct that that work was published about 421 BC (*Text*: 4–5; *Notes* :3–4), then Hellanikos is the first extant author to refer to the other three trials before the Areiopagos, let alone to arrange them chronologically (something even Jacoby attributes to him at *Text*: 24). The only other fifth-century author to refer to the trial of Ares in the court of the Areiopagos is Euripides in the *Elektra* (v. 1258–63), which is usually thought to have been produced about 416 BC, and again in the *Iphigeneia in Tauris* (v. 945–6) of, perhaps, 413 BC. In both, the trial of Ares is the founding trial, but in neither does the Areiopagos council form the jury. In the *Elektra*, in fact, the gods are identified as the jury, just as they are later in the fourth century for both Ares and Orestes in a speech by Demosthenes (23.66).

By the later fourth century, in fact, the two trials of Ares and Orestes have become a canonical pair (cf. Deinarkhos: 1.87; Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.2 [Ares]; Apollodoros, *Epitome*: 6.25 [Orestes]; Pausanias: 1.28.5). Missing, however, is any reference to the other two trials, those of Kephalos and Daidalos. Only the Athidographers and later authors dependent upon them (e.g. Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.15.1[Kephalos] and 3.15.8 [Daidalos]; Diodoros: 4.76.4–7 [Daidalos]) refer to them. And before Hellanikos there is no tradition about either trial (as distinct from the actual homicides), as Jacoby admits (*Text*: 24; *Notes*: 22). In fact, the best attested version of the Kephalos and Prokris myth from the generation before Hellanikos, that by the Athenian genealogist/mythographer, Pherekydes (*FGrHist*: 3 F34), undoubtedly assumes that there was no prosecution of Kephalos (*pace* Jacoby, *Notes*: 22).

Nor is Jacoby's case helped by invoking etymology. As Wallace has shown (1985:213–14), neither Aiskhylos' nor Hellanikos' etymology of the name Areios pagos (nor indeed any derivation based upon

‘Ares’) has a sound basis, so there is no reason to believe that one was older than the other. In fact, the Atthidographers were just as keen to try their hand at the etymological game as the dramatists. No more convincing is his argument from the types of homicide involved (*Notes*: 22). In the homicide law of the fifth and fourth centuries the Athenians distinguished between justified homicide (*dikaios phonos*), such as Ares’ killing of Halirrhothios, unintentional or unwilling homicide (*akousios phonos*), such as Kephalos’ manslaughter of Prokris, and intentional or willed homicide (*hekousios phonos* or *phonos ek pronoias*), like Daidalos’ murder of Talos. Only the last was within the competence of the Areiopagos in those centuries (there were, in fact, four other courts, each of which had its own foundation myth; see Paus.: 1.28.9–12, and for details about Athenian homicide law, in general, see MacDowell 1963). Because the trials of Ares and Kephalos would not have taken place before the Areiopagos in the fifth century, Jacoby finds it hard to believe that anyone would have invented and attributed these cases to the Areiopagos at that time, and concludes that they must have originated in a time when the Areiopagos tried all types of homicide. Unfortunately, not only is the notion that the Areiopagos ever had a competence over all homicide cases open to question, but ironically Jacoby is caught in this instance by his own argument. After all, it is he who most vigorously advocates that Aiskhylos invented the Orestes-trial in the mid-fifth century, a trial which he believes was one of justified (*dikaios*) homicide (*Text*: 24) and consequently outside the competence of the Areiopagos.

In conclusion, though the current opinion, that prior to Aiskhylos’ *Eumenides* Athenian tradition ascribed the founding myth of the Areiopagos to the trial of Ares and that Aiskhylos chose to ignore that fact when he made the trial of Orestes the first homicide trial before the court, may be correct, there is no extant evidence to support that view and the possibility cannot be excluded that Hellanikos was responsible for more than the chronological arrangement that we find in these fragments.

On one point, however, Jacoby is surely correct. The chronological calculations in the fragment of Hellanikos, which place the trials each three generations apart, Ares’ in the time of Kekrops or maybe the first year of Kranaos, Kephalos’ in the time of Erekhtheus (cf. #35), Daidalos’ in Aigeus’ reign, and the trial of Orestes under Demophon, son of Theseus (cf. *MP*, epoch 25), not only come from his *Priestesses of Argos* rather than the *Atthis*, but also most likely presuppose a total of nine, instead of eleven, Attic kings from the beginning to the Trojan War (*Text*: 16; *Notes*: 12–13), a period of about 300 years. If that is correct, it is probable that Hellanikos had no place for two of the eleven kings we find in the list from *MP* onward,

either the doublets, Kekrops II and Pandion II, or Amphiktyon and Erikhthonios. They were introduced to the list as a chronological refinement by someone between Hellanikos and Philokhoros.

#32–34 (Androtion F3–4b/Philokhoros F4, 20a–b and 196/Phanodemos F10): These fragments provide the basis for the view that the major Atthidographers believed that from pre-Solonian times (i.e. **#32** comes from Androtion's first book, which dealt with the monarchy) the Areiopagos had competence over more crimes than homicide (*pace* Wallace 1985:189), and to that extent are in agreement with the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* (3.6). On the other hand, none of them at any point even hint at a constitutional authority for the council at any time let alone this early, as is claimed for it in the *Athenaion Politeia* (3.6; 8.2), and the conclusion has to be that they did not agree with Aristotle on this (*Androtion*: 85). The historical question, whether Aristotle was correct, is usually answered in his favour (see e.g. Rhodes, *Commentary*: 106–7), but has been challenged by Wallace (1985:3–47), who holds the view that it was Solon in 594 BC who extended the Areiopagos' function from exclusively a homicide court to a political council (see the discussion in *Androtion*: 85–7). Equally contentious is the historiographical question, whether their disagreement resulted from fifth-century political propaganda about the nature of the early constitution, as many believed (see e.g. Jacoby, *Text*: 23–5), though in that case the contrary arguments of Wallace (1985:87–93; 219–28) are compelling (*Androtion*: 87). The alternative possibility, that the moralising and rather conservative terminology used in these fragments (especially **#34**) shows the influence of the *Areiopagitikos* written by the fourth-century teacher Isokrates, also loses force when one considers that the early Greek lawmakers often legislated on issues of morality (see *Androtion*: 87), i.e. they did not need Isokrates to show them how to do that.

What we can conclude from their disagreement, however, is that Aristotle did not get his ideas about the Areiopagos from the *Atthis*. This conclusion is confirmed by the contradictory position he takes from the Atthidographers (at least, Androtion and Philokhoros) about the composition of the council. Whilst all agree that the members were chosen from the elite aristocracy (on the basis of birth and wealth), they disagree about the way the council was formed. Aristotle implies that its membership was cumulative, since he says that all nine annual magistrates (archons) joined the council for life, *after* they had completed their year in office (*Ath. Pol.*: 3.6: cf. Rhodes, *Commentary*: 107), whilst Androtion, if he is quoted correctly (Jacoby, *Notes*: 108), seems to say (**#33a**) that it was made up of archons *in office*. Furthermore, Androtion says nothing about membership for life, and

the citation from Philokhoros (in the same passage), that the membership *reached* a total of 51, is hard to understand on Aristotle's terms. This disagreement has sparked vigorous debate, especially since the number 51 recollects an obscure judicial unit of pre-Solonian Athens, the *ephetai*, whose existence as a homicide jury of precisely that number is attested as early as the lawcode of Drakon (*IG*, I³: 104.17). This has led many scholars to identify the *ephetai* with the Areiopagos (most recently Wallace 1985:11–22), but the idea has not been unanimously welcomed (Hignett, 1952:308ff.; cf. *Androtion*: 88–9). It is, however, quite likely that, unlike Aristotle, Philokhoros (and probably Androtion) did identify the two bodies.

#35 (Istros F14): This passage from Istros' *Synagoge* is textually corrupt (at the point indicated by the asterisk), but clear enough to supply some useful information about what the Atthidographic tradition (for that is what he represents) said regarding Athenian homicide law. In the first place, he confirms that the trial of Kephalos for the killing of Prokris was part of the tradition, and also that it took place in the reign of Erekhtheus. More interestingly, his reference to Erekhtheus' fixing his spear on the tomb of Prokris both reinforces the significance of the allusion in Hellanikos F1 (**#29**) to Ares striking 'his spear on the ground' and reveals that the Atthidographers were concerned with the mythical antecedents of the homicide procedure, as well as the stories surrounding the trials. The clearly ancient action of striking the ground with a spear at a funeral was part of the religious ritual for signifying that a person had died a violent death and was a prelude to a prosecution, as is described in a passage from Dem.: 47.68–73 (cf. e.g. Harpokration, *Lexikon* s.v. 'epenegkein doru' and see MacDowell 1963:13–20, 23–5). Finally, although we have no explicit testimony from the fragments, we can probably infer from the obvious interest in procedure shown by Istros and Hellanikos that the Atthidographers also narrated the mythical background of the rock of Shamelessness and the rock of Arrogance that are mentioned by Pausanias (1.28.5).

Appendix 7

NOTES ON AMPHIKTYON

#37a–b (Philokhoros F5a–b). Jacoby suggests (*Text*: 267–8) that this fragment from the second book of Philokhoros’ *Atthis* was part of an extensive digression on Dionysos, of which he felt FF6–7 and 170–3 might also be a part. They are all concerned with ritual aspects of Dionysos or the Horai (e.g. F173, ‘Athenians boil rather than roast the meat they sacrifice to the Horai’) or are general observations about the god (e.g. F6: ‘it should not be thought that Dionysos was a buffoon or a knave’ or F7a: Dionysos acquired his reputation for effeminacy ‘because he armed women along with men’), the location of his tomb at Delphi (F7b: ‘it is possible to see his tomb beside that of Apollo the golden. On it is inscribed, here lies the dead body of Dionysos the son of Semele’) or the effects of wine (F170: ‘men who drink not only reveal their own true nature, but also unveil that of others by their freedom of speech’). Only F6 and F7a are assigned a book number (second), the rest are neither datable nor necessarily attributable to the *Atthis*. Besides, interpretation is very speculative (see Jacoby, *Text*: 267–75; 545–7). If we could be sure that Jacoby was correct in his guess that they all belong to the *Atthis* and came from the same digression on Dionysos, that would tell us something about the material Philokhoros was willing to include in his Chronicle, but it would not show that this was typical of the genre. Since, however, Philokhoros wrote several other works specifically on cult practice and ritual, Jacoby’s hypothesis is unprovable, as even he admits. Nevertheless, it is an intriguing observation (*Text*: 268) that attitudes to Dionysos may have changed since the time of Alexander the Great, whose precursor in exploration (especially to the borders of the Indus) Dionysos was considered to be (cf. Arrian: 5.1.3; Curtius: 8.10.1f.). It is possible that for some (e.g. Arrian: 6.28.1–2), but not all (cf. Diodoros: 17.106.1; Plutarch, *Alexander*: 67.1–7; Curtius: 8.10.18, 9.10.22–8), the post-Alexandrian Dionysos had to become more civilized and less irrational than his earlier self, especially in the highly-charged issue of drunkenness, and this may be reflected in the original information and interpretation put forward by Philokhoros in F5a–b (and in some of the other fragments mentioned above).

Philokhoros F5a–b (**#37a–b**) concerns a purely Athenian tradition

about the arrival of Dionysos into Attika, a tradition which was preserved by the chronographers Eusebios and Georgios the Synkellos (probably from Philokhoros), though they felt obliged to distinguish this Dionysos from the son of Semele. They surely did so because they recognized a chronological problem in respect of other accounts of the beginnings of Dionysiac worship in Athens, especially the association of the establishment of the Great Dionysia with the bringing of the wooden statue (*xoanon*) of Dionysos from Eleutherai (Pausanias: 1.38.8), which was believed to belong in the sixth century. They dodged this chronological bullet by inventing a different Dionysos, and they were not alone (cf. Diodoros: 3.68; 4.4.1). Pausanias, however, blithely ignored any problems and reports elsewhere (1.2.5) that he saw at Athens a group of clay figures that represented Amphiktyon giving a banquet to Dionysos and the other Olympians surely on the occasion of his introduction into the city by Pegasos of Eleutherai. Strangely, by contrast, the author of *MP* makes no mention of Dionysos at all, let alone his arrival into Athens, though he is not reticent about other gods (see, for example, his entries on Demeter and the Mysteries between epochs 12 and 17). This leaves the possibility open that the account given here was not treated by *MP*'s Attidographic source and supports the view that it may have originated with Philokhoros himself. But, if so, while he clearly was writing about Dionysos, son of Semele, he was careful not to assign to this period any of the historical festivals or major cult sites of the god Dionysos in Athens, especially not the temenos *en Limnais*, the oldest sanctuary of Dionysos in Athens, according to Thucydides (2.15.4).

The fragment makes reference to an otherwise unmentioned altar for Dionysos, who bears an equally unattested title (Orthos – ‘upright’), and attempts to interpret it. The interpretation is peculiar. As Jacoby astutely observes (*Text*: 270; *Notes*: 188–9), ‘upright’ in the context of Dionysos is more likely to mean ‘erect’ than to refer to the ability to remain standing after drinking unmixed wine. The story does, however, reveal Dionysos teaching the civilizing practice of watering wine to moderate the effect of his own gift, the disastrous results of which were recorded in another cautionary Athenian tale, that of Ikarios who was murdered by shepherds who had been intoxicated by his unmixed wine, and his daughter Erigone who hung herself as a result and became the *aition* for the ritual of the swinging girls (the *aioria*) (Pausanias: 1.2.5; Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.14.7; cf. Kearns 1989:167, 172). And it may not be coincidental that the practice of mixing wine with water is first taught (it was a *heurema* – an invention) at Athens, which thus becomes the source of its dissemination. Philokhoros may, of course, be supplying new information about Athenian cult and ritual from his own knowledge

and research, but in the absence of any supporting evidence for the existence of the altars mentioned or the sanctuary of the Horai, or even the cult titles ‘orthos’ or ‘Good God’, Jacoby’s hypothesis about the tendentious origin and purpose of this fragment remains attractive. But, then, we might have to accept that the man who is often called the first scholar of Atthidography was more chauvinistic than some of his predecessors.

F206 (#38): Philokhoros’ certain involvement in this fragment is restricted to the last sentence about the location of the deme, Semakhidai. We cannot be sure that he was responsible for the rest. The possibility that he was, however, is supported by the similar story in Georgios Synkellos, whose ultimate source for much of his material (via Eusebios and Kastor) was Philokhoros. Further corroboration might be seen in the presence of Dionysos in the story told by Synkellos, since, as we saw above, Philokhoros appears to be the first to have brought Dionysos to Athens in the reign of Amphiktyon. But this is a story of different origin and antiquity from the fragments discussed above.

Semakhos must be the eponym of the Kleisthenic deme, Semakhidai, and the probable *genos* of the same name (Parker 1996:326; with reservation, Kearns 1989:98 and n. 93). As such, he was surely the subject of a traditional tale that originated at least before the end of the sixth century (i.e. before Kleisthenes). He was similar in this to Ikarios, the eponym of the deme Ikaria (*IG*, I³: 253.6f.), who was mentioned above as having an unfortunate association with Dionysiac worship. Semakhos, by contrast, was an example of the benefits that came to those who welcomed the god, as can be seen from the fact that his daughter (in Synkellos) was given the god’s fawnskin (an indication that she was initiated into his cult), or his daughters (in Stephanos) became his priestesses. The inference is that the *genos*, Semakhidai, held an ancestral priesthood of Dionysos, either in the deme, wherever that was (Traill 1975: map 1, tentatively locates it in northern Attika, between Oinoe and Aphidna, but *IG*, II²: 1582.54 mentions a Semakheion, i.e. a shrine of the hero Semakhos, at Laurion in the far south of Attika), or elsewhere. Both Semakhos and Ikarios offer excellent examples of the way local cultic and priestly traditions inspired the stories that became the basis of the *Atthis*. At the same time, this whole entry reveals the Atheno-centric tendency of the genre, not only in relation to the rest of Greece, towards whom Athenians promoted themselves as the source of civilization, but also in the case of the outlying regions of Attika, whose local traditions were absorbed into the story of Athens.

Appendix 8
NOTES ON EREKHTHEUS

The arrival of Demeter and her gift of grain to Triptolemos

One fragment from Phanodemos (#44) and two from Philokhoros (#52 and #53a–c), survive to show that this important story was treated by the Atthidographers, though it would be surprising if it had not. Although the citation from Synkellos/Eusebios (#53a) actually situates the arrival of Demeter at the end of the reign of Pandion, the testimony of *MP* argues for the traditional date. It is a recognized fault of Eusebios' *Canons* that the historical snippets inserted between the chronological columns could be displaced up or down (Cadoux 1948:87–8). It is most unlikely that the Atthidographers dated her arrival other than in the reign of Erekhtheus.

The earliest and fullest version of the myth is, of course, the *Hymn to Demeter* (well discussed in Richardson 1974:1–30, 74–86; Foley 1993:79–178), which probably dates from the late seventh or early sixth century (Richardson 1974:7–11). The hymn is usually considered to belong to a time before Eleusis entered the Athenian synoecism by those who date that event to the early seventh century (e.g. Sealey 1976:92–5), since it makes no mention of Athens, even though the sanctuary was probably administered by Athens from the time of Peisistratos (if not before), and later tradition treats the story as essentially Athenian. But the late dating of the synoecism has come into question recently (see Parker 1996:10–17) and the difference between the accounts may simply be a matter of emphasis (Parker 1996:98–9): the Eleusinian hymn focussing upon the establishment of the Mysteries (cf. Pausanias: 1.38.3), the Athenian tradition giving preference to the gift (to Athens) of grain and its cultivation, the basis of the civilization that was Athens' gift to the world (cf. Isokrates, *Panegyrikos*: 28–30). In the process Triptolemos was elevated to a new importance, as the instructor to the world of the agricultural revolution (Richardson 1974:9). Artistic representations of him on Demeter's winged chariot begin to appear at Athens first about 540.

The brief fragment from Phanodemos contains the first extant reference to Attika as being the location of the rape of Persephone (cf. Pausanias: 1.38.5; Richardson 1974:76. For a review of the numerous other locations attested see Richardson 1974:148–50 and the discussion in Jacoby, *Text*: 195–6).

The fragments of Philokhoros, which refer to topics as far removed

from each other as Iambe's jest and Triptolemos' ship, show that he, at least, must have dealt with the story quite extensively. In keeping with Atthidographic practice he probably used the Iambe element to explain the etymology of the word 'iambic', even though Conti cites Nikander for that. He also rationalized Triptolemos' winged chariot, which was his original mode of transportation in the sixth and fifth century, into a ship with sails like wings (cf. #15). The version given by Boccaccio is evidently quite confused.

Eumolpos and the war between Athens and Eleusis

The tradition of a war (of unspecified cause) between Athens under Erekhtheus and the Eleusinians led by Eumolpos was referred to by Thucydides (2.15.1). We have no idea how old this tradition was, but it does not appear to be early, since it was not even hinted at by the *Hymn to Demeter* (though see Simms 1983:197–208). Thucydides may, in fact, be the first to refer to the story. In that case, he may be transmitting accepted Athenian oral tradition. But if, as has already been suggested, Hellanikos was Thucydides' source for material on the mythical period of Athenian history, his reference will be the result of revision made after 406. In that case both historians will have disagreed with a previously staged version of this story, i.e. Euripides' play *Erekhtheus*, which was produced sometime between 422 and 416 (Jouan and Van Looy 2000:98–9). In that version Eumolpos was not an Eleusinian but a Thracian leading an army of Thracians. He was a son of Poseidon and Khione and his mission was to avenge his father's defeat by Athena in their contest for Athens. This version became popular in fourth-century Athens, where it was clearly easier to accept the notion of Athenian resistance to an invasion from barbarian Thrace than to believe in internal conflict within Attika. The story became part of the national propaganda of Athens as the *polis* that had defended Greek civilization against outside aggression, whether from Amazons, Thracians or Persians (see notoriously Plato, *Menexenos*: 239a–41e). Only Phanodemos goes so far as to make the enemy Boiotian (#43).

One of the casualties in all this was Eumolpos: a respected chieftain at Eleusis in the *Hymn to Demeter* and the eponymous hero of the *genos* Eumolpidae, who controlled the most important priesthood at Eleusis (Clinton 1974: *passim*; Kearns 1989:163), he became confused with a barbarian invader, who was either invited to help the Eleusinians (Apollodoros, *Bibliotheka*: 3.15.4) or actually became their king (for all the possibilities see Simms 1983:197–208). Various attempts were made in antiquity to undo the confusion by creating fictitious genealogies (e.g. #54), which aimed at distinguishing him from the Thracian and tended to associate him rather with Orpheus and Mousaios (cf. *MP*, epochs 14 and 15, and for the Orphic involvement, see Richardson 1974:77–86; Kearns 1989:114–15). It was the Thracian Eumolpos, or his son Immarados (Pausanias:

1.38.3), who was accepted as the one killed in battle by Erekhtheus, for which he himself was destroyed by Poseidon.

Erekhtheus' daughters/the Hyakinthides

Both Phanodemos and Philokhoros (#43, 48) attest cult worship in Athens of the daughters of Erekhtheus, who are identified as the Hyakinthides or Parthenoi (Maidens) by Phanodemos. Regarding the existence of sacred rituals in their own time and the specifics of the practices used (i.e. that the sacrifices were wineless and what that meant), the Atthidographers are not likely to err, though we have been unable to identify the location Phanodemos mentions.

It is a different matter, however, when one comes to their account of the 'myth' behind the ritual. That, as so often, is confused and contradictory. The late, but authoritative, author Apollodoros assigned four daughters to Erekhtheus and his wife, Praxithea. These were Prokris, Orithyia, Khthonia and Kreousa. Each had her own story (*Bibliotheka*: 3.15.1–4). Prokris married Kephalos. Her accidental death at his hand was one of the homicides tried at the Areiopagos (see above). Khthonia was married to Boutes, brother of Erekhtheus. Orithyia was carried off by Boreas, the north-wind (rationalized by Philokhoros in #45 into a human), and became the mother of Khione, whose union with Poseidon produced Eumolpos the Thracian. Kreousa married Xouthos (Kleidemos F19 #47 must have been garbled by the scholiast) and by him (or Apollo) had Ion (see below). None was, however, sacrificed for the state. Nor were they called Parthenoi or Hyakinthides. Quite the contrary, Apollodoros knew of other girls of this title, who were the daughters of a Lakedaimonian called Hyakinthos. He came to Athens during the reign of Aigeus, when the Athenians were under siege by Minos, and his daughters, Antheis, Aigleis, Lytaia and Orthaia, were sacrificed by the Athenians on the grave of Geraistos in fulfilment of an oracle (*Bibliotheka*: 3.15.8).

Apollodoros' version is in complete disagreement with the patriotic Athenian tradition outlined above, which appears to reach back to Euripides. He wrote several plays on the theme of individual self-sacrifice (especially by young women) for the state (Wilkins 1990:177–94; cf. O'Connor-Visser 1987: *passim*), one of which was his *Erekhtheus*. In this play Erekhtheus and Praxithea have three daughters (all unnamed), one of whom has to die to save Athens from Eumolpos. The justification for her sacrifice that is put into the mouth of her mother, Praxithea, was grist for Lykourgos' inflammatory

patriotic rhetoric in his speech *Against Leokrates* (98–101; cf. Dem.: 60.27). Her two sisters swear to immolate themselves on her grave. At the end of the play it is decreed by Athena that all three will be honoured with annual rituals as the Hyakinthides (F22.73–89). Athena also places them amongst the stars, probably changing their name to Hyads. Euripides alluded earlier to the same theme in the *Ion* (277–80), where he recognized Kreousa as one of the daughters of Erekhtheus and has her explain that she escaped sacrifice only because she was still a babe in arms.

Several considerations support the conclusion that Apollodoros' version was the traditional one; first, the excuse Euripides puts forward for Kreousa's escape; second, his studied avoidance of naming the girls in the *Erekhtheus*; third, the fact that Phanodemos knew the same four daughters as Apollodoros and felt the need to add two other unattested names for the ones who were sacrificed (Protogeneia and Pandora). Here we have a useful glimpse into the relationship between the creative impulse of the fifth-century dramatists and the critical instincts of the Attidographers.

Finally, it should not be overlooked that in #22 (Philokhoros F105) it is Aglauros, daughter of Kekrops, who saved the city in the war against Eleusis, by throwing herself off the acropolis.

Ion

Ion, son of Xouthos, was also believed to have brought assistance to Erekhtheus in the war against Eumolpos (Strabo: 8.7.1 C383; against Eleusis in Pausanias: 7.1.5), though how his intervention was made to fit beside the story recounted above is not clear. Ion was not an Attic hero. He was depicted as an outsider from the Peloponnese, who served as a polemarch, a leader in war (Herodotos: 8.44.2; Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*: 3.2; Pausanias: 1.31.3), not a king (though see Euripides, *Ion*: 1571–5). He was not even an early hero, though he was belatedly given Panhellenic connections by making him son of Xouthos, son of Hellen, who otherwise lacked a legend, and through his concocted relationship by name with the Ionian branch of the Greek people (Herodotos: 7.94). After the war with Eumolpos (if not before, cf. Strabo: 8.7.1. C383), he supposedly settled in Attika (in the Marathonian tetrapolis) and re-organized the Athenians into the traditional four Ionian tribes (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*: 41.2), named after his sons (Herodotos: 5.66), whose descendants went on to colonize Asia (Euripides, *Ion*: 1581–8). He was believed to have died and been buried at Potamoi or Parapotamioi in Attika (Pausanias: 1.31.3, 7.1.5). He is associated with the deme Ionidai by Kearns (1989:174), which is tentatively located by Traill (1975: map 2) south of Pentelikon, near the deme Gargettos, whose eponym also had a son called Ion, who emigrated to Elis (Pausanias: 6.22.7).

The obvious assumption is that he and his involvement with Athens were both invented at a time when the Athenians, who had long been known as Iaones (see Homer, *Iliad*: 13.685; Solon in Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*: 5.2; Kleidemos F13 #46; Androtion F61 #55), were laying claim to being the metropolis of the Ionian cities of Asia Minor. When that was is unclear. Possibilities range from the geometric period, when Athens was a cultural centre with a sphere of influence that reached through the Cyclades to Rhodes, to the time of Solon, who described Athens as ‘the oldest city of Iaonia’, or under Peisistratos, who asserted Athenian control over the Ionian religious centre at Delos. We can only be sure that the story was in place by Herodotos’ time. Subsequently Euripides, original as always, tried to give Ion a divine parent (Apollo) in his *Ion*, but his invention was not adopted by the *Atthis*, at least not to judge by Philokhoros.

For Aristotle it was Ion’s political activity that was significant (*Ath.*

Pol.: F1:3.2, 41.2; see Rhodes, *Commentary*: 66–73). No doubt it was for the Atthidographers also, but it is noteworthy that here, as so often, Philokhoros (#49) is cited for Ion’s connection (contra Kleidemos F18 #75) to a festival, the Boedromia (on which see Parke 1977:53). If the etymology for its name given by Harpokration at the end was derived from Philokhoros, it is unfortunate, because it appears to put the emphasis on the wrong part (‘running’) of the compound. A more likely derivation, following the *Etymologikon Magnum (Genuinum)*, s.v. Boedromion, stresses the battle shout (Robertson 1992:22–3), associated with the worship of Apollo Enyalios.

The Skira(phoria)

Philokhoros F14 and F15 (**#50** and **#51**) provide two pieces of information about the confusing festival of Athena Skiras, called the Skiraphoria or just Skira, which took place in the Attic month Skirophorion. In F14 he is cited for one of several explanations of its name (for the others see Jacoby, *Text*: 286–94; Parke 1977:156–8), his being to trace it to an Eleusinian prophet, Skiros (cf. Kearns 1989:197–8). A fuller version of his account is probably to be found in Pausanias (1.36.4), where Skiros is directly connected to the war of Erekhtheus with Eleusis, and his death and burial at a place along the Sacred Road from Athens to Eleusis provide the terminus (the Skiron) for the procession described by Lysimakhides. Whilst Philokhoros' explanation may not have any more authority than others, it does at least help us to understand the involvement of the Eleusinian goddesses, Demeter and Persephone (and Dionysos), in a ceremony conducted by the priests of Athena and Poseidon-Erekhtheus, the Eteoboutadai (on whom see Parker 1996:290–3).

The whole of F15 (**#51**) probably originates with Philokhoros, since the grammarian Aristodemos likely used the Atthidographer as his source (see Jacoby, *Text*: 300–1). The statement that the race and subsequent *komos* (revel) in honour of Dionysos took place at the Skira is, therefore, to be treated with respect. It has, however, led to confusion with another festival, the Oskhophoria, which involved a similar procession (and possibly a race) from the temple of Dionysos in Athens to the sanctuary of Athena Skiras at Phaleron and was said to have been established by Theseus. On this see the discussion of Philokhoros F111 (**#65**) (in [Chapter 3](#)).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

All texts of ancient authors are cited by standard editions, unless otherwise indicated.

Adler, W. and Tuffin, P. (2002), *The Chronology of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation* (New York).

Ager, S. (1996), *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London).

Andrewes, A. (1974), 'The Arginousai Trial', *Phoenix* 28: 112–22.

Badian, E. (1987), 'The Peace of Callias', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107: 1–39.

——(1988), 'Towards a Chronology of the Pentekontaetia down to the Renewal of the Peace of Callias', *Classical Views/Echos du Monde Classique* 7: 289–320.

——(1993), *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia* (Baltimore).

Bertelli, L. (2001), 'Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford): 67–94.

Billows, R. A. (1990), *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).

Bloch, H. (1940), 'Studies in Historical Literature of the Fourth Century B.C.', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Supp. I, 303–76.

Blok, J. (1995), *Early Amazons: Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth* (London and New York).

——(2000), 'Phye's Procession: Culture, Politics and Peisistratid Rule', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence* (Amsterdam): 17–48.

Bollansée, J. (1999), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, IVa. 3: *Hermippos of Smyrna* (Leiden).

Bowie, E. L. (1986), 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106: 13–35.

——(2001), 'Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry?', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*

Bringmann, K. (1965), *Studien zu den politischen Ideen des Isokrates* (*Hypomnemata*, vol. 14, Göttingen).

Briquel, D. (1984), *Les Pélasges en Italie: Recherche sur l'histoire de la Légende* (Rome).

Brommer, K. (1982), *Theseus* (Darmstadt).

Brulé, P. (1987), *La Fille d'Athènes* (Paris).

Brunt, P. A. (1980), 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *Classical Quarterly* 74: 477–94.

Buckler, J. (1989), *Philip II and the Sacred War* (*Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 109, Leiden, New York, Copenhagen, Cologne).

Bugh, G. (1988), *The Horsemen of Athens* (Princeton).

Bundgaard, J. A. (1957), *Mnesicles: A Greek Architect at Work* (Stockholm).

Burkert, W. (1966), 'Kekropidensage und Arrhephoria', *Hermes* 94: 1–25.

——(1985), *Greek Religion*, trans. J. Raffan (Cambridge, MA).

Burstein, S. (1985), *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Kleopatra VII* (Cambridge).

Busolt, G. (1893–1904), *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaironeia* 3 vols (Gotha).

Cadoux, T. J. (1948), 'The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 68: 70–123.

Calame, C. (1990), *Thésée et l'Imaginaire athénien* (Lausanne).

Carawan, E. (1991), 'Ephetai and the Athenian Courts for Homicide in the Age of the Orators', *Classical Philology* 86: 1–16.

——(1998), *Rhetoric and the Law of Draco* (Oxford).

Carey, C. and Reid, R. A. (eds) (1985), *Demosthenes: Selected Private Speeches* (Cambridge).

Cargill, J. (1981), *The Second Athenian League* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).

Carlson, K. T. ed. (2001), *A Stó:lo Coast Salish Historical Atlas* (Vancouver, Seattle, Chilliwack).

- Cawkwell, G. (1978), *Philip of Macedon* (London and Boston).
- Chambers, M. (1990), 'The Genesis of Jacoby's *Atthis*', E. M. Craik (ed.), in *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford).
- Clinton, K. (1974), *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Philadelphia).
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J. and Lee, K. H. (eds) (1995), *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, Vol. I (Warminster).
- Connelly, J. B. (1996), 'Parthenon and *Parthenos*: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze', *American Journal of Archaeology* 100: 53–80.
- Conti, Natale, (1651), *Mythologiae* (Geneva).
- Cook, J. M. (1962), *The Greeks in Ionia and the East* (London).
- Crosby, M. (1950), 'The Leases of the Laureion Mines', *Hesperia* 19: 189–312.
- (1957), 'More Fragments of Mining Leases from the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 26: 1–23.
- Davison, J. A. (1958), 'Notes on the Panathenaea', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 78: 23–42.
- (1962), 'Notes on the Panathenaea', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 82: 141–2.
- de Romilly, J. (1968), *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism*, trans. P. Thody (Oxford).
- Derow, P. and Parker, R. (eds) (2003), *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford).
- Desborough, V. R. d'A. (1972), *The Greek Dark Age* (London).
- de Simone, C. (1996), *I Tirreni a Lemnos: Evidenza linguistica e tradizioni storiche* (Firenze).
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (1972), *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London).
- (2004), *Athenian Democratic Origins and other Essays* (Oxford).
- Dillon, M. (2002), *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion* (London).
- Dindorf, W. (1829), *Aristides* (Leipzig).
- Dodd, D. B. and Faraone, C. (2003), *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives* (London and New York).

- Donnay, G. (1968), 'La Date du Procès de Phidias', *L'Antiquité Classique* 37: 19–36.
- (1997), 'L' arrhéphorie: initiation ou rite civique? Un cas d'école', *Kernos* 10: 177–205.
- Dontas, G. (1983), 'The True Aglaurion', *Hesperia* 52: 48–63.
- Dover, K. J. (1968), *Aristophanes: Clouds* (Oxford).
- Dunbar, N. (1995), *Aristophanes: Birds* (Oxford).
- Engels, J. (1989), *Studien zur politischen Biographie des Hypereides* (Munich).
- Faraone, C. (2003), 'Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis: female initiation or substitute sacrifice?', in D. Dodd and C. Faraone (eds), *Initiation in Greek Rituals and Narratives* (London): 43–68.
- Ferguson, W. S. (1911), *Hellenistic Athens* (London).
- Foley, H. P. (1993), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Princeton).
- Fornara, C. (1983), *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- Forrest, W. G. (1969), 'The Tradition of Hippias' Expulsion from Athens', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 10: 277–86.
- Forsén, B. and Stanton, G. (1996), *The Pnyx in the History of Athens* (Helsinki).
- Fotheringham, J. K. (1923), *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones* (London).
- Fowler, R. L. (1996), 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116: 62–87.
- (2001), 'Early Historie and Literacy', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, New York): 95–115.
- Frost, F. (1964), 'Pericles, Thucydides, son of Melesias, and Athenian Politics before the War', *Historia* 13: 385–99.
- Furley, W. (1996), *Andokides and the Herms* (BICS Supp. 65, London).
- Gabrielsen, V. (1994), *Financing the Athenian Fleet* (Baltimore and London).
- Gagarin, M. (1981), *Drakon and Early Athenian Homicide Law* (New Haven and London).

- Gaisford, T. (1848), *Etymologicum Magnum* (Oxford).
- Gaiser, K. (1988), *Philodems Academica (Supplementum Platonicum I*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt).
- Garland, R. (1987), *The Piraeus* (Ithaca, NY).
- Garnsey, P. (1988), *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis* (Cambridge).
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2001), 'Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, New York): 286–313.
- Giangiulio, M. (2001), 'Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, New York): 116–37.
- Gibson, C. A. (2002), *Interpreting a Classic: Demosthenes and his Ancient Commentators* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- Gomme, A. W. (1933), *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Oxford).
- Graf, F. (2003), 'Initiation: A Concept with a Troubled History', in D. Dodd and C. Faraone (eds), *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives* (London): 3–25.
- Green, P. (1970), *The Year of Salamis* (London).
- Habicht, C. (1997), *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. D. Schneider (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Hammond, N. G. L. (1994), *Philip of Macedon* (London).
- Hammond, N. G. L. and Griffith, G. T. (1979), *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2 (Oxford).
- Hansen, M. H. (1975), *Eisangelia: The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and the Impeachment of Generals and Politicians* (Odense).
- (1985), *Demography and Democracy* (Herning).
- (1987), *The Athenian Assembly* (Oxford).
- (1988), *Three Studies in Athenian Demography* (Copenhagen)
- Harding, P. (1974), 'The Theramenes Myth', *Phoenix* 28: 101–11.
- (1976), 'Androtion's Political Career', *Historia* 25: 186–200.

- (1977), 'Atthis and Politeia', *Historia* 26: 148–60.
- (1987a), 'Rhetoric and Politics in Fourth Century Athens', *Phoenix* 41: 25–39.
- (1987b), 'Metics, Foreigners or Slaves? The recipients of Honours in IG II² 10', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 67: 176–82.
- (1994), 'Comedy and Rhetoric', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London): 196–221.
- (1995), 'Athenian Foreign Policy in the Fourth Century', *Klio* 77: 105–25.
- (2000), 'Demosthenes in the Underworld: A Chapter in the *nachleben* of a rhetor', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator* (London): 246–71.
- (2007), 'Local History and Atthidography', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford): 180–8.
- Heckel, W. (1980), 'Marsyas of Pella, Historian of Macedon', *Hermes* 108: 444–60.
- Henderson, J. (1987), *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (Oxford).
- Herter, H. (1939), 'Theseus der Athener', *Rheinisches Museum* 88: 244–326.
- Hey, D. (ed.) (1996), *Oxford Companion to Local and Family History* (New York).
- Hignett, C. (1952), *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford).
- (1963), *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford).
- Hollis, A. S. (1990), *Callimachus: Hecale* (Oxford).
- Hommel, H. (1940), 'Die dreissig Trittyen des Kleisthenes', *Klio* 33: 181–200.
- Hopper, R. J. (1953), 'The Attic Silver Mines in the Fourth Century B.C.', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 48: 200–54.
- (1968), 'The Laurion Mines: A Reconsideration', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 63: 293–326.
- How, W. W. and Wells, J. (1912), *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 2 vols (Oxford).
- Humphreys, S. (1997), 'Fragments, Fetishes, and Philosophies', in G. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments* (Göttingen): 207–24.
- Hunt, P. (2001), 'The Slaves and the Generals of Arginousae', *American Journal of Philology* 122: 359–80.

- Hunter, R. (ed.) (2005), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge).
- Hurwit, J. M. (1999), *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present* (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne).
- Jacoby, F. (1904), *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin).
- (1909), 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Geschichtsschreibung und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9: 80–123.
- Jameson, M. H., Jordan, D. R. and Kotansky, R. D. (1993), *The Lex Sacra from Selinous (Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs, 11, Durham, NC).*
- Jouan, F. and van Looy, H. (eds) (2000), *Euripide, Tome VIII. 2, Fragments: Bellérophon – Protésilas* (Paris).
- Joyce, C. (1999), 'Was Hellenikos the First Chronicler of Athens?' and 'Exchange with L. Porciani', *Histos* 3.
- Kagan, D. (1969), *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca and London).
- (1974), *The Archidamian War* (Ithaca and London).
- (1981), *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition* (Ithaca and London).
- (1987), *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca and London).
- Kearns, E. (1989), *The Heroes of Attica (BICS Suppl. 57, London).*
- Kinzl, K. (1974), 'Philochoros *FGrHist* 328 F115 and Ephoros: Observations on the schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 7. 9b', *Hermes* 102: 179–90.
- Koster, W. J. W. (ed.) (1975–), *Scholia in Aristophanem* (Groningen).
- Kraay, C. M. (1956), 'The Archaic Owls of Athens. Classification and Chronology', *Numismatic Chronicle* 16: 43–68.
- (1968), 'An Interpretation of *Ath. Pol.*, ch. 10', in C. Kraay and G. Jenkins (eds), *Essays in Greek Coinage presented to Stanley Robinson* (Oxford): 1–9.
- (1976), *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London).
- Krentz, P. (1982), *The Thirty at Athens* (Ithaca and London).
- Kron, U. (1976), *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen: Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen* (Berlin).

Lambert, S. D. (1993), *The Phratries of Attica* (Ann Arbor).

Lavelle, B. M. 'Hipparchos' Herms', *Classical Views/Echos du Monde Classique* 29: 411–20.

——(1988), 'Adikia, the Decree of Kannonos and the Trial of the Generals', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 39: 19–41.

——(2005), *Fame, Money, and Power: The Rise of Peisistratos and 'Democratic' Tyranny at Athens* (Ann Arbor).

Lazenby, J. F. (1993), *The Defence of Greece, 490–479 B.C.* (Warminster).

Lewis, D. M. (1954), 'Notes on Attic Inscriptions', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 49: 17–50.

——(1959), 'Attic Manumissions', *Hesperia* 28: 208–38.

——(1977), *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden).

Lloyd, M. (1994), *Euripides: Andromache* (Warminster).

Loraux, N. (1986), *The Invention of Athens*, trans. A. Sheridan (Cambridge, MA).

——(2000), *Born of the Earth: Myth and Politics in Athens*, trans. S. Stewart (Ithaca and London).

Luraghi, N. (ed.) (2001), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford and New York).

MacDowell, D. M. (1962), *Andokides: On the Mysteries* (Oxford).

——(1963), *Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators* (Manchester).

——(1971), *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford).

——(1978), *The Law in Classical Athens* (London).

——(1990), *Demosthenes: Against Meidias* (Oxford).

Marincola, J. (1999), 'Genres, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography', in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, Boston, Cologne): 281–324.

Meiggs, R. (1972), *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford).

Meritt, B. D. and Wade-Gery, H. T. (1957), 'Athenian Resources in 449 and 431 B.C.', *Hesperia* 26: 163–97.

- Mikalson, J. D. (1975), *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton).
- (1976), 'Erechtheus and the Panathenaia', *American Journal of Philology* 97: 141–53.
- Mills, S. (1997), *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford).
- Mitchel, F. (1970), *Lykourgan Athens: 338–322* (Semple Lectures, Cincinnati).
- Möller, A. (2001), 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford and New York).
- Moscato Castelnovo, L. (1980), 'La carriera politica dell' Attidografo Androzione', *ACME* 33: 251–78.
- Mosshammer, A. A. (1979), *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg and London).
- (ed.) (1984), *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga Chronographica* (Leipzig).
- Naber, S. A. (1864–5), *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* (Leiden).
- Neils, J. (ed.) (1992), *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Princeton).
- (ed.) (1996), *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon* (Madison).
- (ed.) (2005), *The Parthenon: From Antiquity to the Present* (Cambridge).
- O'Connor-Visser, E. A. M. E. (1987), *Aspects of Human Sacrifice in the Tragedies of Euripides* (Amsterdam).
- Olson, S. D. (1998), *Aristophanes: Peace* (Oxford).
- Osborne, M. J. (1981), *Naturalization in Athens*, vol. 1 (Brussels).
- (1982), *Naturalization in Athens*, vol. 2 (Brussels).
- (1983), *Naturalization in Athens*, vols 3–4 (Brussels).
- Parke, H. W. (1977), *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca).
- Parker, R. (1996), *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford).
- Patterson, C. (1981), *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451–450 B.C.* (New York).

- Pearson, L. (1942), *The Local Historians of Attica* (American Philological Association, Monograph 11, Lancaster).
- (1962), 'The Pseudo-History of Messenia and its Authors', *Historia* 11: 397–426.
- Pesely, G. E. (1994), 'Did Aristotle use Androtion's *Atthis*?', *Klio* 76: 155–71.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949–1953), *Callimachus*, 2 vols (Oxford).
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (1994), *L'Aphrodite grecque* (Kernos, Supp. 4, Athens and Liège).
- Platnauer, M. (1964), *Aristophanes: Peace* (Oxford).
- Podlecki, A. J. P. (1987), *Plutarch: Life of Pericles* (Bristol).
- (1989), *Aeschylus: Eumenides* (Warminster).
- Powell, A. (ed.) (1990), *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality* (London and New York).
- Pritchett, W. K. P. (1969), *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography, Part 2 (Battlefields)* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- (1971), *Ancient Greek Military Practices, Part 1* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- (1995), *Thucydides' Pentekontaetia and Other Essays* (Amsterdam).
- (1996), *Greek Archives, Cults, and Topography* (Amsterdam).
- Rhodes, P. J. (1972), *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford).
- (1980), 'Athenian Democracy after 403 B.C.', *Classical Journal* 75: 305–23.
- (1990), 'The Atthidographers', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser (eds), *Purposes of History* (*Studia Hellenistica*, 30, Louvain): 73–81.
- (1994), 'The Ostracism of Hyperbolus', in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower, *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford): 85–98.
- Rhodes, P. J. and Osborne, R. (eds) (2003), *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford).
- Richardson, N. J. (1974), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford).
- Robertson, N. (1983), 'The Riddle of the Arrhephoria' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 87: 241–88.

——(1985), 'The Origin of the Panathenaia', *Rheinisches Museum* 128: 231–95.

——(1992), *Festivals and Legends: The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual* (Toronto, Buffalo, London).

Rosenbloom, D. (2004), 'Ponerai vs. Chrestoi: The Ostracism of Hyperbolos and the Struggle for Hegemony in Athens after the Death of Perikles', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 134: 55–105 (part 1), 323–58 (part 2).

Ruschenbusch, E. (1966), *SOLΩNOS NOMOI* (*Historia*, Einzelschrift 9, Wiesbaden).

Ryder, T. T. B. (2000), 'Demosthenes and Philip II', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator* (London and New York): 45–89.

Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (ed.) (2000), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence* (Amsterdam).

Scheer, E. (1908), *Alexandra* (Berlin).

Schwartz, E. (1887), *Scholia in Euripidem*. Vol. 1: *Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas* (Berlin).

Sealey, R. (1960), 'Regionalism in archaic Athens', *Historia* 9: 155–80.

——(1976), *A History of the Greek City States, 700–338 B.C.* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).

——(1993), *Demosthenes and His Time* (Oxford).

Shear, T. L., Jr. (1978), *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* (*Hesperia*, Supp. 17, Princeton).

Shrimpton, G. (1991), *Theopompos the Historian* (Montreal and Kingston, London, Buffalo).

——(1997), *History and Memory in Ancient Greece* (Montreal and Kingston, London, Buffalo).

Sickinger, J. P. (1999), *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens* (Chapel Hill).

Simms, R. M. (1983), 'Eumolpos and the Wars of Athens', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 24: 197–208.

Slings, S. R. (2000), 'Literature in Athens, 566–510 BC', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence* (Amsterdam): 57–77.

Smith, O. L. (1976), *Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae exstant omnia*, Part I: *Agamemnon, Eumenides, Supplices continens* (Leipzig).

Snell, B. (1959), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Leipzig).

Sommerstein, A. H. (1989), *Aeschylus: Eumenides* (Cambridge).

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1979), *Theseus as Son and Stepson* (*BICS*, Supp. 40, London).

——(1988), *Studies in Girls' Transitions: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography* (Athens).

——(2003), 'Herodotos (and Others) on Pelasgians: Some Perceptions of Ethnicity', in P. Derow and R. Parker (eds), *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford).

Spence, I. G. (1987), 'Athenian Cavalry Numbers in the Peloponnesian War: *IG I³ 375* Revisited', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 67: 167–75.

Stadter, P. (1989), *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (Chapel Hill and London).
Stevens, P. T. (1971), *Euripides: Andromache* (Oxford).

Strauss, B. (1986), *Athens after the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca and New York).

Stroud, R. S. (1968), *Drakon's Law on Homicide* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

——(1978), 'State Documents in Archaic Athens', in *Athens Comes of Age* (Princeton): 21–42.

——(1979), *The Axones and Kyrbeis of Solon* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).

——(1998), *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3* (*Hesperia*, Supp. 29, Princeton).

Thomas, R. (1989), *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).

Thompson, W. E. (1985), 'Fragments of the Preserved Historians – Especially Polybius', in *The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Papers presented to A. E. Raubitschek* (Saratoga): 119–39.

Thomsen, R. (1964), *Eisphora* (Copenhagen).

Tracy, S. V. (1991), 'The Panathenaic Festival and Games: An Epigraphic Inquiry', *Nikephoros* 4: 133–53.

Traill, J. S. (1975), *The Political Organization of Attica* (*Hesperia*, Supp. 14, Princeton).

Travlos, J. (1971), *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (New York and

Washington).

Tyrrell, W. B. (1984), *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Myth-making* (Baltimore and London).

Usener, H. (1912), *Kleine Schriften* (Stuttgart).

van der Vin, J. P. A. (2000), 'Coins in Athens at the Time of Peisistratos', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence* (Amsterdam): 147–53.

van Sichelen, L. (1987), 'Nouvelles orientations dans l'étude de l'Arrhephorie attique', *Acta Classica* 56: 88–102.

Vansina, J. (1985), *Oral Tradition as History* (London and Madison).

Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J. (1973), *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (Cambridge).

Vidal-Naquet, P. (1986), *The Black Hunter*, trans. A. Szegedy-Maszak (Baltimore).

von Fritz, K. (1940), 'Athidographers and Exegetae', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 71: 91–126.

Walker, H. J. (1995), *Theseus and Athens* (Oxford and New York).

Wallace, R. W. (1985), *The Areopagos Council to 307 B.C.* (Baltimore and London).

Wallinga, H. T. (2000), 'The Athenian Naukraroi', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence* (Amsterdam): 131–46.

Wankel, H. (1976), *Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, 2 vols (Heidelberg).

Ward, A. (ed.) (1970), *The Quest for Theseus* (London).

West, M. L. (1985), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford).

Whitehead, D. (2000), *Hypereides: The Forensic Speeches* (Oxford).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1893), *Aristoteles und Athen*, 2 vols (Berlin).

Wilkins, J. (1990), 'The State and the Individual: Euripides' Plays of Voluntary Self-Sacrifice', in A. Powell (ed.), *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality* (London and New York): 177–94.

Williams, J. M. (1982), *Athens without Democracy: The Oligarchy of Phocion and the Tyranny of Demetrios of Phaleron, 322–307 B.C.* (Diss. Yale).

Willink, C. W. (1986), *Euripides: Orestes* (Oxford).

Worthington, I. (1992), *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus* (Ann Arbor).

CONCORDANCE OF FRAGMENTS

HELLANIKOS (*FGrHist*: 323a)

Jacoby

1
2
3
4
5a
5b
6
7
8
9
10a
10b
11
13
14
15
16a
16b
17a
17b
17c
18
19
20
21a
21b
21c
22a
22b
23
24a

Harding

19/29
39
59
227
228a
228b
105
229
230
231
6a
6b
90
232
62
71
72a
72b
74a
74b
74c
76a
76b
76c
86a
86b
86c
30a
30b
89
156a

Jacoby

24b
24c
25

Harding

156b
156c
169

26	170
27	1
28	118

HELLANIKOS, *Phoronis* (FGrHist: 4)

4	13
---	----

KLEIDEMOS (FGrHist: 323)

1	233
2	234
3	235
4	126
5a	236a
5b	236b
5c	236c
6	237
7	106
8	107
9	233
10	157
11	238
12	239
13	46
15	97
16	14
17	63
18	75
19	47

<i>Jacoby</i>	<i>Harding</i>
20	87
21	119
22	122
23	240
24	241
25	242
26	243
27	244

ANDROTION (FGrHist 324)

1	20
2	39
3	32
4a	33a
4b	33b
5	108
6	109
7	245
8	145
9	151
10	174
11	172
12	246
13	247
14	248
15	249
16	250
17	251
18	175
19	194
20	252
21	253
22	195
23	254
24	198
25	255
26	256
27	257
28	258
29	259
30	200
31	260
32	261
33	136
34	93
35	98
36	95
37	132
38	134
39	144
40	150
41	154
42	155
43	163
44	167
45	168
46	177
47	179
48	182
49	262
50	184
51	189

52	206
53	207
54a	263a
54b	263b
55	264a
56	265
57	133
58	36
59	266
60a	2a
60b	2b
60c	2c
61a	55a
61b	55b
62	81
63	267
64	268
65	269
66	270
67	271
68	272

PHANODEMOS (*FGrHist* 325)

<i>Jacoby</i>	<i>Harding</i>
1	273
2	28
3	232
4	43
5	57
6	5
7	274
8	275
9	276
10	34
11	88
12	277
13	3
14a	278a
14b	278b
15	279
16	87
17	280
18	281
19	282
20	283
21	284

22	123
23	127
24	120
26	82
27	44/77

MELANTHIOS (*FGrHist* 326)

1	285
---	-----

DEMON (*FGrHist* 327)

1	91
2	5
5	64
6	67

PHILOKHOROS (*FGrHist* 328)

<i>Jacoby</i>	<i>Harding</i>
2a	4a
2b	4b
3	31
4	32
5a	37a
5b	37b
6	App. 7–37a-b
7a	App. 7–37a-b
7b	App. 7–37a-b
8	40
9	41
10	21
11	45
12	48
13	49
14	50
15	51
16	69
17a	66a
17b	66b
17c	66c
18a	78a
18b	78b
18c	78c
19	85

20a	32
20b	33a
20c	33b
21	96
22a	99a
22b	99b
23	101
24	110
25	111
26	112
27	113
28	114
29	115
30	116
31	100
32a	286a
32b	286b

Jacoby

33
34a
34b
35a
35b
36
37
38
39
40a
40b
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49/50/51
52
53/54/55a
55b
56a
56b
57
58
59
60
61

Harding

128
129a
129b
287a
287b
137
139
140
141
180a
180b
185
191
192
193
186
187
198
223
201
206
212
213b
214a
214b
288
289
203
215
290

62	291
63	292
64a	218a
64b	125/218b
65	219
66	220
67	224
68	293
69–70a	225a
69–70b	225b
71	294
92a	6a
92b	6b
93	7
94	8
95	9
96	10
97	11
98	12
99	15
100	16
101	17
102	42
103	52
104a	53a
104b	53b
105	22
106	23
107	56
108	58
109	61
110	73
111	65
112	83
113	84
114	94
115	103
116	121
117	124
118	130
119	131
120	132
121	135
122	138
123	142
124	143
125	144
126	160
127	146
128a	147a
128b	147b
129	148
130	149

131	152
132	153
133	158
134	159
135a	161a
135b	161b
136	163
137	162

Jacoby

138
139a
139b
140
141a/b
142
143
144/145
146
147
148
149a
149b
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169a
169b
170
171
172
173
177

Harding

164
165a
165b
166
170
171
173
176
181
175
178
183a
183b
182
188
196
197
199
200
202
207
208
209
210
213a
211
216
217
221
222
226
295
264a
264b
App.7–37a-b
296
297
App.7–37a-b
298

180	299
181	190
182	5
183	24/68
184	300
187	301
194	48
196	34
197a	302a
197b	302b
198	303
199	304
200	102
201	305
202	104
203	117
204	306
205	307
206	38
211	92
223	204
224	205

THE WRITERS OF THE ATTHIDES (*FGrHist* 329)

1	18
2	56
3	86b
4	124

AMELESAGORAS (*FGrHist* 330)

1	26
---	----

BION OF PROKONNESOS (*FGrHist* 332)

1	27
---	----

ISTROS (*FGrHist* 334)

4	39
7	79
8	70
10	80
14	35
18	278a
22	54
27	25
31	60

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

For clarity, original passages are shown in regular type, and page references to this volume in **bold sans serif** type.

Aelian

On the Nature of Animals:

12.35 **104**

Varia Historia:

8.6 **180**

Aiskhines

Against Timarkhos:

1.77–8 **157–8**;

1.103 **188**;

1.142 **180**

On the False Embassy:

2.31 **76**;

2.168 **120**

Against Ktesiphon:

3.25 **189**;

3.51 **149**

Aiskhylos

Eumenides:

681 **205**;

685–90 **66**;

1011 **31**

Libation Bearers:

612–22 **51**

Persai:

37 **19–20**;

466–7 **105**;

975 **19–20**

Ammonios

(FGrHist 350):

F2 **70**

Anaximenes

(FGrHist 72):

F27 **130**

Andokides

On the Mysteries:

1.62 **130**;

1.83 **88**;

1.96–8 **134**;

1.*passim* **129**

On the Peace:

Argument **145**;

3.3 [175](#)

Andron of Halikarnassos

(*FGrHist* 10):

F1 [55](#);

F6 [63](#);

F13 [46](#)

Antiatticista

Genesia [187](#)

Antigonos of Karystos

Mirabilia:

12 [28](#)

Apollodoros of Athens

(*FGrHist* 244):

F38 [156](#);

F94 [34](#);

F106 [14](#);

F111 [182](#);

F133 [76](#)

Apollodoros

Bibliothēke:

3.13.3 [199](#);

3.14.1 [22](#);

3.14.2 [30](#);

3.14.5 [31](#), [38](#);

3.14.6 [28–9](#), [31–2](#), [38–9](#), [41](#);

3.14.7 [211](#);

3.14.7–3.15.1 [42](#);

3.14.8 [47](#);

3.15.1 [206](#);

3.15.1–4 [215](#);

3.15.4 [47](#), [214](#);

3.15.5–6 [49](#);

3.15.5–16.2 [51](#);

3.15.8 [206](#), [215](#);

3.15.6–Epitome 1.24 [52](#);

3.15.6–Epitome 1.1–4 [54](#);

3.15.7–Epitome 1.7–15 [59](#);

Epitome 1.15 [60](#), [65](#), [66](#);

Epitome 1.23–4 [74](#);

Epitome 6.25 [206](#)

Apollonios of Akharnai

(*FGrHist* 365):

F3 [183](#)

Aristophanes

Akharnians:

75 [31](#);

266 [121](#)

Birds:

123 [31](#);

832 [26](#), [197](#);

1204 [171](#)

Lysistrata:

481 [31](#);

641–2 [201](#);
644–5 [198](#)

Peace:

347 [123](#);
356 [120](#);
605–11 [118](#)

Ploutos:

173 [144](#)

Wasps:

438 [191](#)

Aristotle

Athenaion Politeia:

1.1 [87](#);
3.2 [216–7](#);
3.3 [88](#);
3.6 [35–6](#), [207–8](#);
4 [88](#);
5–13 [88](#);
5–22 [87](#);
5.2 [216](#);
7.1 [88](#), [90](#);
8.2 [35](#), [208](#);
8.3 [97](#);
8.4 [35](#);
10 [94](#);
13.4 [49](#);
13.5 [158](#);
14.1 [87](#);
14.4 [91](#);
15.3 [91](#);
18.1 [92–3](#);
18.3 [55](#);
19.3–4 [94](#);
19.5 [26](#), [197](#);
19.6 [97](#);
20–22 [99](#), [100](#);
22.3 [103](#);
22.7 [94](#);
23.1 [103](#);
23.4–24.1 [109](#);

24.3 [101](#);
25.1–2 [109–110](#);
26.4 [115](#);
27.2 [122](#);
28 [137](#);
28.3 [124](#);
29.2 [132](#);
32–7 [137](#);
34.1 [134–5](#);
35.1 [140](#);
38.1 [140](#);
41.2 [47](#), [53](#), [72](#), [216–7](#);

42.1 **158**;
43.5 **101**;
47.2 **94**;
48.1–2 **98**;
49.1 **186**;
49.4 **188**;
53.4 **120–1**;
53.7 **121**;
54.2 **110**;
54.3 **189**;
55.5 **90**;
57.3 **76**;
60 **41**;
61.7 **171**;
F1 **217**;
F2 **13, 72, 87**;
F3 **185, 192–3**

Ethica Nicomachea:

5.7.1134b22 **135**

Rhetorika:

2.23.1400b19 **88**

Arrian

Anabasis:

5.1.3 **210**;
6.28.1–2 **210**

Athenaios

Deipnosophistai:

1.16 p.9cd **180**;
1.35 p.20a **182**;
2.7 p.38cd **37**;
3.50 p.96de **80**;
3.81 p.114c **182**;
4.65 p.168a **35**;
5.15 p.189c **186**;
5.58 p.217de **130**;
6.26 p.235a **177**;
6.46 p.245c **168**;
9.17 p.375bc **180**;
9.47 p.392d **29**;
10.49 p.437cd **75**;
11.13 p.464f **187**;
11.92 p.495e **45**;
13.2 p.555d **193**;
13.4 p.556f-557b **69**;
13.89 p.609cd **90**;
14.24 p.628a **187**;
14.42 p.637f-638a **92**;
14.79 p.660ab **7, 176**;
14.80 p.660de **177**;
15.48 p.693de **37**;
15.50 p.695ab **93**;
15.52 p.697a **170**

Bion of Prokonnesos

(FGrHist 332):

F1 [200](#)

Boccaccio

Genealogia deorum gentilium:

8.4 [45](#);

11.6 [68](#);

11.26 [59](#)

Cicero

De Legibus:

2.25 [194](#);

2.63 [194](#)

Clement of Alexandria

Stromateis:

1.80.1 [87](#);

1.104.2 [73](#)

Conti, Natale

Mythologiae:

3.16 [45](#);

9.10 [50](#)

Curtius Rufus

History of Alexander:

8.10.1 [210](#);

8.10.18 [210](#);

9.10.22–8 [210](#)

Deinarkhos

Against Demosthenes:

1.87 [206](#)

Demetrios of Phaleron

(FGrHist 228):

F1–3 [123](#);

F3 [131](#)

Demosthenes

Olynthiacs:

3.11 [111](#);

3.31 [44](#), [111](#)

First Philippic:

4.24 [144](#);

4.34 [152](#), [163](#);

4.35 [39](#), [186](#)

On the Khersonese:

8.24 [80](#)

Fourth Philippic:

10.34 [160](#)

Reply to Philip's Letter:

11.5 [163](#)

On the Symmories:

14.30 [147](#)

On behalf of Ktesiphon:

18.32 [152](#);

18.72 [163](#);

18.87 **163**;
18.107 **174, 186**;
18.139 **139**;
18.295 **98**

On the False Embassy:

19.84 **152**;
19.148 **179**;
19.168 **39**;
19.303 **200**

Against Meidias:

21.144 **94**

Against Androtion:

22.48 **148**;
22.69–77 **149**;
22.70 **189**

Against Aristokrates:

23.22–86 **88**;
23.66 **206**;
23.104ff. **150**;
23.163 **180**;
23.166–7 **180**

Against Timokrates:

24.114 **120**;
24.176–86 **149**

Against Aristogeiton:

25.79–80 **165**

Against Aphobos I:

27.7 **146**

Against Apatourios:

33.20 **178**

Against Pantainetos:

37, *passim* **94**

Against Makartatos:

43.57 **88**

Against Euergos:

47.18–45 **186**;
47.26 **143**;
47.53–73 **88**;
47.68–73 **209**

Against Polykles:

50.20–23 **149–50**

Against Nikostratos:

53.15 **188**

Against Konon:

54.7 **182**;
54.26 **90**

Against Euboulides:

57.23 **185**;
57.43 **183**;
57.67 **185**;
57.69 **183**

Against Neaira:

59.75 **72**

Epitaphios:

60.27 **215**;

60.29 **55**

[Demosthenes]

Letter from Philip:

12.6 **160**;

12.11 **160**

Didymos

On Demosthenes:

Col.1.13–18 **161**;

Col.1.18–25 **161**;

Col.1.29–60 **162**;

Col.1.67–2.2 **163**;

Col.7.11–28 **145**;

Col.7.28–51 **141**;

Col.7.51–54 **144**;

Col.7.62–71 **147**;

Col.8.7–26 **159**;

Col.10.34–11.5 **161**;

Col.11.37–51 **164**;

Col.11.66–12.33 **81**;

Col.13.40–57 **153**;

Col.14.35–49 **153–4**

Diodoros Siculus

2.45.3 **64, 66**;

3.68 **211**;

4.4.1 **211**;

4.63.4 **74**;

4.76.4–7 **206**;

4.79 **60**;

11.18.4 **105**;

11.55 **100**;

11.60–2 **107**;

11.63.1–64.4 **108**;

11.84.8 **108–9**;

12.3–4 **111**;

12.7.22 **113**;

12.36.2–3 **120**;

12.39–40 **118**;

12.40.2 **119**;

12.79.1–7 **127**;

13.12.6 **131**;

13.52–3 **134**;

13.97.1 **136**;

13.100–103.2 **37**;

14.33.5 **140**;

14.81.1–3 **143**;

14.85.2–3 **144**;

15.20.2 **146**;

15.38 **148**;

15.62.2 **148**;

15.67.2 **148**;

16.3.7 [150](#);
16.21.1–4 [151](#);
16.34.4 [160](#);
16.35.5–7 [152](#);
16.37.3 [152](#);
16.44 [160](#);
16.74.2–76.4 [163](#);
16.77.2 [163](#);
17.15 [55](#);
17.106 [210](#);
17.108.4–8 [167](#);
18.18.9 [153](#), [169](#);
20.45.1–46.4 [171](#);
20.110 [173](#)

Diogenes Lairtios

5.9–10 [156](#)

Dionysios the Argive

(*FGrHist* 308):

F1 [74](#)

Dionysios of Halikarnassos

Ad Ammaium:

1.5 [156](#);
1.9 [2](#), [154](#);
1.10.3 [155](#);
1.11.3–5 [162](#);
1.11.6 [164](#)

On Deinarkhos:

3 [170](#), [171](#);
9 [173](#);
13 [151](#), [153](#), [160](#)

Roman Antiquities:

1.8.3 [2](#);
1.17–30 [24](#), [196](#);
1.28.3 [23](#);
1.61.4 [15](#)

Dionysios

(*FGrHist* 687):

F3 [174](#)

Ephoros

(*FGrHist* 70):

F37 [149](#);
F103 [181](#);
F209 [143](#);
F215 [148](#)

Eratosthenes

(*FGrHist* 241):

F38 [113](#)

Etymologicum Genuinum

reios Pagos [27](#), [33](#);
Brisaios [180](#)

Etymologicum Magnum

Asty [15](#);

reios Pagos **27**, **33**;
retesion **72**;
Boedromion **217**;
Tauropolos **182**;
Theseion **187**

Euripides

Andromakhe:

445ff. **133**

Elektra:

1258–63 **206**

Erechtheus:

F22. 65–89 **47**;

F22. 73–89 **215**;

F22. 92–4 **47**

Ion:

13 **32**;

268–74 **28**;

277–80 **216**;

281–2 **47**;

1163–4 **191**;

1571–5 **216**;

1581–8 **216**

Iphigeneia in Aulis:

247–8 **32**

Iphigeneia in Tauris:

942 **76**;

945–6 **206**;

1450 **32**

Phoinissai:

1706 **32**

Suppliants:

403–8 **72**;

566 **70**;

635 **70**

Eusebios

Chronica:

Oly.39.4 **87**;

Oly.46.2 **88**

Praeparatio Evangelica:

10.10.7 **14**

Eustathius

On Homer:

Iliad , 6.378 **183**

Harpokration

Lexikon

Adynatoi **188**;

Alope **97**;

Alopeke **98**;

Amphiktyones **37–8**;

Amphipolis **118**;

A non-epopteus **172**;

Antigrapheus **189**;

Apodektai [97](#);
Autokhthones [14](#);
Basketbearers [40](#);
Boedromia [44](#);
“Bring a spear” [35](#), [209](#);
Call-up by eponymi [120](#);
Datos [149](#);
Deka kai dekadoukhos [139](#);
Diapsephisis [157](#);
Dispatchers [186](#);
Epiboion [27](#);
Epi Palladio [76](#);
Erythrians [80](#);
Euandria [40](#);
Gamelia [183](#);
Gennetai [184](#);
Grupanion [184](#);
Hagnias [140](#);
Hamippoi [186](#);
Hekate’s Island [181](#);
Hermes by the Gate [143–4](#);
Hierophant [175](#);
Hipparkhos [98](#);
Katatome [185](#);
Kephisodotos [149](#);
Kerameis [98](#);
Khalkeia [183](#);
Kolonetai [98](#);
Leokoreion [182](#);
Lithos [90](#);
Lykeion [120](#);
Melanippeion [176](#);
Melite [98](#);
Neosi [179](#);
Nomophylakes [168](#);
Mercenary force at Korinth [144](#);
Molpis [139](#);
Mounikhia [174](#);
Of the epoptai [172](#);
Oiethen [99](#);
Oion [99](#);
One thousand two hundred [146](#);
Ophryneion [178](#);
Oskhophoroi [62](#);
Pegai [175](#);
Peristoikoi [188](#);
Phorbanteion [55](#);
Phyle [186](#);
Processions and processing [148](#);
Pykni [7](#), [97](#);
Sacred trireme [152](#);
Skiron [44](#);
Stephanephoros [175](#);

Stryme [149](#);

Syngrapheis [132](#);

Symmory [146](#);

That six thousand [147](#);

Theorika [111](#);

Theoris [165](#);

These Propylaia [119](#);

Trikephalos [92](#);

Tritopatores [17](#)

Hegesippos

(*FGrHist* 391):

F4 [76](#)

Hekataios

(*FGrHist* 1):

F119 [192](#);

F167 [174](#);

F322 [182](#)

Heliodoros

(*FGrHist* 373)

On the Akropolis at Athens:

F1 [119](#)

Hellenika Oxyrhynchia

7.1 [141](#), [143](#)

Herakleides Lembos

Epitome of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians*:

F1 [47](#), [53](#), [85](#)

Epitome of Hermippos;

On Lawgivers [21](#), [193](#)

Herodotos

1.1–5 [17](#);

1.29–32 [88](#);

1.56.2 [16](#);

1.56–8 [25](#);

1.60 [91](#);

1.62 [91](#);

1.142.5 [192](#);

1.142.8 [81](#);

1.173 [42](#), [49](#), [51](#);

2.53 [10](#);

2.77.4 [182](#);

4.1–2 [204](#);

4.28 [66](#);

4.170.1 [60](#);

5.55–6 [93](#);

5.62.2 [81](#), [94](#);

5.63.1 [94](#);

5.64 [26](#), [197](#);

5.65.3 [80](#), [81](#);

5.66 [216](#);

5.71 [87](#);

5.82–9 [110–11](#);

6.125.1 [81](#);

6.137–40 [25](#), [197](#);
7.92 [42](#), [49](#);
7.94 [216](#);
7.144.1–2 [94](#);
7.200 [38](#);
8.44.2 [14](#), [20](#), [22](#), [25](#), [29](#), [30–1](#), [41](#), [216](#);
8.55 [46](#);
9.27.1–5 [66](#), [71](#)

Hesiod

Theogony:

806 [19](#)

Hesychios

Aglauros [200](#);

Agoraios Hermes [92](#);

Akhanas [184](#);

Drakhme khalazousa [112](#);

Galeoi [184](#);

Hieros Polemos [113](#);

Horsemen [121](#);

Proeresia [177](#);

Prooikia [177](#);

Seventh Ox [177](#);

Tauros [184](#);

Wells of Agamemnon [177](#)

Hieronymos

(*FGrHist* 154):

F1 [130](#)

Homer

Iliad:

2.546–52 [40](#), [46](#), [73–4](#);

6.305 [30](#);

13.685 [216](#);

15.684 [186](#)

Odyssey:

1.85 [19](#);

7.78–81 [40](#), [46](#)

Hypereides

Against Demeas:

F90 [183](#)

Against Demosthenes:

5.10 [166](#);

9 [185](#);

24 [110](#)

For Euxenippos:

7–8 [190](#)

On behalf of Khairephilos:

F1 [97](#)

Inscriptions

Fouilles de Delphes:

III 1. 511 [8](#)

IG I²: 363–7 [119](#);

837 [93](#)

*IG I*³: 78.54–59 **26**, **197**;

84 **81**, **101**;

104.17 **76**, **77**, **88**, **208**;

105 **134**;

421–430 **130**;

462–6 **119**;

1062 **81**;

1383 **81**

*IG II*²: 10 **136**;

14 **143**;

114 **150**;

204 **154**;

216–7 **149**;

223 **8**;

261 **149**;

334 **41**;

580 **47**;

1138 **42**;

1144 **42**;

1157 **42**;

1233 **81**;

1357 **46**;

1388 **137**;

1582.54 **212**;

1597.19–21 **78**;

1609. 88–9 **153**;

1629.242–58 **186**;

1656–64 **144**;

3459 **200**;

3472 **201**;

3488 **201**;

3515 **201**;

3554–6 **201**;

4258 **81**

IG VII;

4252–4 **8**

IG XII.5;

445.12 **150**

IG XII.7;

5 **151**

Isaios

On the Estate of Pyrrhos:

3.76 **183**;

3.79 **183**

On the Inheritance of Apollodoros:

7.1 **185**;

7.13 **185**

On the Estate of Kiron:

8.18 **183**

Against Eukleides:

F61 **140**

Against Iskhomakhos:

F74 **146**

Isokrates

Panegyrikos:

4.23–8 [17](#);

4.28–30 [213](#);

4.54–60 [71](#);

4.68–70 [66](#)

Panathenaikos:

5.17 [40](#)

Areopagitikos:

7.58 [132](#)

On the Peace:

8.56 [111](#);

8.108 [186](#)

Antidosis:

15.109 [148](#);

15.129 [72](#), [151](#);

15.232 [94](#)

Against Kallimakhos:

18.5 [139](#)

Justin

Epitoma:

5.9.14–10.3 [140](#);

5.10.4 [140](#);

8.2.8–12 [152](#)

[**Justin Martyr**];

Cohortatio ad Graecos 9 [18](#)

Kallimakhos

Hymn 6:

To Demeter [30](#)

Krateros

(*FGrHist* 342):

F11 [189](#)

Ktesias

Persika:

26 [105](#)

Lexikon Rhetoricum

Deipnophoros [27](#), [62](#);

Epi Palladio [76](#)

Lexikon Rhetoricum Cantabrigense

Eisangelia [189–90](#);

Kerykes [27](#);

Nomophylakes [110](#), [168](#);

Ostracism [99](#);

Paralos and Salaminia [171](#)

Libanios

Hypothesis:

Demosthenes 57 [158](#)

Lykourgos

Against Leokrates:

86 [81](#);

98–101 [215](#);

117–18 [98](#)

Against Lykophron:

F68 [40](#)

Lysias

Epitaphios:

2.4–6 [66](#);

2.7–16 [71](#)

Against Eratosthenes:

12.54–5 [140](#)

On the Handicapped Person:

24, *passim* [189](#)

On the Estate of Diogenes:

35.4 [139](#)

Lysimakhides

(*FGrHist* 336);

F3 [44](#), [217](#)

Macrobius

Saturnalia:

1.7.36 [194](#);

1.10.22 [21](#);

3.8.2 [188](#)

Marcellinus

Life of Thucydides:

28–9 [116](#);

32 [131](#)

Marmor Parium (MP)

(*FGrHist* 239)

Part A:

Heading [20](#);

Ep.1 [18](#), [20](#), [192](#);

Ep.2 [20](#);

Ep.3 [30](#), [33](#);

Ep.4 [30](#), [38](#), [193](#);

Ep.5 [36](#);

Ep.6 [36](#);

Ep.7 [36](#);

Ep.8 [36](#);

Ep.10 [39](#);

Ep.11 [42](#);

Ep.12 [42](#), [211](#);

Ep.13 [42](#);

Ep.14 [42](#);

Ep.15 [43](#);

Ep.17 [211](#);

Ep.19 [50](#);

Ep.20 [53](#), [72](#), [192](#);

Ep.21 [53](#);

Ep.22 [53](#);

Ep.23 [73](#);

Ep.24 [74](#);
Ep.25 [33](#), [75–6](#);
Ep.26 [75](#);
Ep.27 [78](#), [192](#);
Ep.30 [82](#);
Ep.31 [83](#);
Ep.32 [83](#), [86](#);
Ep.37 [113](#);
Ep.40 [90](#);
Ep.45 [92](#), [96](#);
Ep.48 [102](#);
Ep.51 [102](#);
Ep.52 [102](#)

Part B:

Ep.20 [171](#);
Ep.21 [171](#)

Marsyas

(*FGrHist* 135–6)

Makedonika:

F12 [118](#);
F15 [130](#)

Maximus the Confessor

Patrologia Graeca:

IV. 16 [34](#);
IV. 17 [34](#)

Myrsilos of Methymna

(*FGrHist* 477):

F9 [23](#), [196](#)

Nepos

Thrasyboulos:

2.5–7 [140](#)

Timotheus:

2.2 [148](#);
3.4–5 [151](#)

Nonnos

Dionysiaka:

41,383–4 [194](#)

Ovid

Metamorphoses:

2.709–833 [199](#);
8.6–151 [51](#);
8.738–884 [30](#)

Papyri

P. Berol.:

5008 A1 [149–50](#);
5008 B27 [99](#);
11521 [43](#)

P. Herc.: 1021 Col.2. 4.38 [155](#);

Col.6.28–38 [156](#)

P. Oxy.: 1241 Col.5.6 [22](#);

1367 Fr.1 **21**

Pausanias

1.1.4 **76**;
1.2.1 **65, 67**;
1.2.5 **211**;
1,2,6 **20, 30–1, 38**;
1.3.3 **84**;
1.3.4 **53**;
1.5.3 **49**;
1.5.5 **42**;
1.8.9 **76**;
1.17.4–6 **66, 74**;
1.17.6 **187**;
1.18.2 **200**;
1.18.5 **30**;
1.18.8 **38**;
1.19.4–5 **51**;
1.19.6 **176**;
1.22.5 **50**;
1.26.6 **46**;
1.27.3 **201**;
1.28.5 **206, 209**;
1.28.9–12 **207**;
1.30.1 **91**;
1.30.2 **32, 38**;
1.31.2 **29, 204**;
1.31.3 **216**;
1.31.5 **175**;
1.36.4 **217**;
1.38.3 **213, 215**;
1.38.5 **213**;
1.38.7 **19**;
1.38.8 **211**;
1.39.3 **56**;
1.41.6 **49**;
2.18.7–8 **80**;
2.18.9 **80, 81**;
2.23.5 **76**;
2.25.6 **74**;
2.33.4–5 **167**;
4.24.5 **108**;
6.7.4–7 **142**;
6.22.7 **216**;
7.1.5 **216**;
7.2–4 **81**;
7.4.6 **60**;
7.25.1 **78**;
7.25.2 **81**;
8.2.1 **41**;
9.3.9 **106**;
9.5.1 **19**;
9.19.5 **19**;
9.33.4 **19**;

10.5.13 [94](#);
10.8.1 [37](#);
10.10.1 [53](#);
10.15.4 [17–18](#);
10.15.5 [7](#)

Pherekydes

(FGrHist 3):

F2 [40](#);
F22 [15](#);
F34 [206](#);
F45 [183](#);
F150 [58](#);
F151 [64](#);
F152 [55](#);
F153 [69](#);
F154 [80](#);
F155 [81](#)

Philodemos

On Piety:

51 [177](#)

Photios

Bibliotheka:

Kallynteria and
Plynteria [200](#);
Orgeones [184](#)

Lexikon:

Adikiou [110](#);
Aglauros [28](#);
Aidruta [177](#);
Brauronia [198](#);
Haimon [174](#);
Hermokopidai [130](#);
Hyes [177](#);
Krepis [190](#);
Naukraria [97](#);
Nomophylakes [168](#);
Panathenaia [41](#);
Parthenoi [4](#);

Pindar

Nemean:

6.44 [19](#);
8.11 [31](#)

Olympian:

7.82 [31](#);
13.38 [31](#)

Pythian:

7 [94](#)

Plato

Euthyphro:

2a [120](#)

Menexenos:

237e-238b [16](#), [17](#);

239b **66, 71**;
239c-241e **214**

Phaidros:

229c **176**

Symposion:

223d **120**

[Plato]

Hipparkhos:

228b **92**;

228b-229b **93**

Plutarch

Alexander:

67.1–7 **210**

Alkibiades:

15.7 **200**;

18–21 **129**;

18.7 **130**

Aristeides:

7.2–6 **100**;

11.3–4 **106**;

19.5 **105**

Demetrios:

8–10 **171**;

12.2 **171**;

24–7 **172**;

26 **173**;

26.3 **173**

Demosthenes:

14.6 **165**;

25.1–26.2 **167**;

29–30 **168**

Kimon:

12.6 **107**;

13.4–5 **111**;

15.2 **110**;

16.4 **108**;

19.1 **111**

Moralia:

628F **106**;

834B **127**;

834D **130**;

841F **185**;

846AB **166**;

847A **167**;

850A **203**;

869A **103**

Nikias:

13.3 **129–30**;

13.5–7 **129**;

13.7–11 **129**;

23.1 **131**;

23.7–8 **131**

Pelopidas:

5.2–3 **146**

Perikles:

9.1 **112**;

9.5 **110**;

10.7 **110**;

13.12 **119**;

21.1–3 **113**;

22.3 **113**;

31.2–5 **118**;

37.3 **114**

Phokion:

28 **169**;

Solon:

1.1 **81**;

1.7 **91**;

12.1–9 **87**;

15.2 **88**;

17.1 **88**;

19.3–5 **35**;

25.3 **90**

Themistokles:

4.1–3 **94**;

10.6 **103**;

10.10 **105**;

13.1 **104**

Theseus:

3.5–7 **51**;

8 **176**;

12 **51**;

13.1 **50**;

14 **56**;

15 **51**;

15.2–16.1 **58**;

17 **51**;

17.3 **57**;

17.6 **58**;

19.1 **57**;

19.4–7 **58**;

19.8 **57**;

22 **51**;

23.2 **61**;

24.2 **72**;

24.3 **41**;

25.1 **191**;

25.4 **50**;

25.5 **63**;

26.1 **64**;

27.1 **64**;

27.2–7 **65**;

29.1–2 **69**;

29.4 **70**;

30–31 **69**;

31 **67, 74**;

32–5 [74](#);
34.2 [76](#);
34.3 [67](#);
35 [68](#)

Pollux

Onomastikon:

5.36 [188](#);
8.19–20 [100](#);
8.52 [190](#);
8.86 [90](#);
8.105 [200](#);
8.118 [76](#);
8.121 [180](#);
8.125 [77](#);
9.61 [88](#);
10.71 [188](#);
10.128 [80](#);
10.191 [200](#)

Polyainos

Strategemata:

3.9.29 [151](#)

Polybios

2.62.7 [147](#)

Scholia

on Aelius Aristeides

On the Four:

3. 165.4 [116](#), [180](#)

Panathenaikos:

13.172 [146](#)

on Aiskhines

Against Timarkhos:

1.53 [153](#)

On the False Embassy:

2.81 [163](#);
2.87 [76](#)

Against Ktesiphon:

3.51 [150](#);
3.85 [161](#)

on Aristophanes

Akharnians:

220 [96](#);
234 [91](#);
961 [76](#)

Birds:

13 [127](#);
556 [112](#);
766 [129](#);
872 [175](#);
997–8 [179](#);
1106 [93](#);
1541 [89](#)

Clouds:

213 [113](#);

549–50 **125**;

984–5 **178**

Ekklesiazousai:

193–6 **142**

Frogs:

218 **185**;

694 **136**;

720 **136**;

1196 **137**;

1422 **135**

Knights:

855 **100**

Lysistrata:

8 **49**;

73–4 **132**;

641 **28**;

835 **185**;

1094 **129**;

1138/1144 **108**

Peace:

145 **102**;

242 **190**;

466 **126**;

475–7 **126**;

605–11 **117**;

665 **124**;

990 **121**;

1032 **131**

Ploutos:

773 **191**;

972 **134**;

1146 **139**

Wasps:

210 **125**;

240 **123**;

544 **40**;

715–18 **114, 125**;

946–8 **115**;

1223 **49**;

1239 **70**

on Demosthenes

For Ktesiphon:

18.107 **174**

On the False Embassy:

19.203 **27**

Against Leptines:

20.52 **143**

Against Meidias:

21.144 **95**

Against Aristokrates:

23.27 **76**

on Euripides

Andromakhe:

445 [122](#)

Hekabe:

123 [73](#)

Hippolytos:

35 [54](#)

Medea:

19 [44](#)

Orestes:

371 [133](#);

772 [133](#);

1094 [38](#);

1648 [33](#);

1651 [34](#)

Phoinissai:

670 [15](#)

on Hesiod

Theogony:

913–4 [68](#);

914 [43](#)

on Homer

Iliad:

1. 594 [24](#);

3.144 [67](#);

13.685 [48](#)

Odyssey:

11.271 [70](#)

on Kallimakhos

F7.29 [43](#)

on Lucian

Kataplous:

28 [24](#)

Timon:

30 [127](#)

on Lykophron

Alexandra:

494–5 [15](#);

573 [67](#);

1332 [64](#)

on Pindar

Isthmian:

7.13 [14](#)

Nemean:

3.2 [171](#);

5.90 [55](#)

Olympian:

3.28 [204](#);

9.45 [21](#)

Pythian:

7.9b [94](#)

on Plato

Symposion:

208D [79](#)

on Sophokles
Oidipous at Kolonos:
100 [44](#);
698–705 [122](#);
1053 [46](#)

Souda

Areios Pagos [27](#), [33](#);
Drakon [87](#);
Epi Palladio [75](#);
Kekrops [19](#);
Parippon kai
koren [85](#);
Philokhoros [2](#);
Rhamnousia
Nemesis [47](#);
Seisakhtheia [89](#);
Trikephalos [92](#)

Stephanos of Byzantion

Ethnika

Airai [179](#);
Aithaia [184](#);
Aitolia [181](#);
Akontion [179](#);
Areios Pagos [34](#);
Argennousa [178](#);
Arkesine [150](#);
Asty [15](#);
Bolissos [181](#);
Delphoi [178](#);
Embaton [151](#);
Eparitai [148](#);
Gresinos [179](#);
Halikarnassos [178](#);
Itea [181](#);
Kalydna [179](#);
Kapai [178](#);
Kropia [181](#);
Malieus [178](#);
Metakhoion [179](#);
Methouriades [178](#);
Nisaia [49](#);
Oinous [179](#);
Panakton [126](#);
Parparon [178](#);
Semakhidai [37](#);
Stryme [179](#);
Telos [179](#);
Tetrapolis [181](#);
Thea [184](#);
Thyrea [181](#);
Xypete [190](#)

Strabo

5.2.4 C221 [24](#);
7.7.1 C321 [25](#);
8.7.1 C383 [216](#);
9.1.5–6 C392 [48](#);
9.1.7 C393 [80](#);
9.1.18 C397 [20](#), [31](#);
9.1.20 C397 [21](#);
9.2.11 C404 [70](#);
9.4.2 C425 [38](#);
14.1–4 C632–3 [81](#)

Synagoge Lex.

Adynatoi [189](#);
Agrai [175–6](#);
Apedon [23](#);
Areios Pagos [27](#), [33](#)

Synkellos, Georgios

Ekloge Chronographias:

p.251 [86](#);
p.289 [20](#);
p.297.14 [36](#);
p.299.16 [45](#), [68](#);
p.304 [43](#);
p.308–9 [59](#);
p.335 [77–9](#);
p.336 [82](#);
p.340 [84](#)

Synkellos Michael

Patrologia Graeca

IV. 620 [35](#)

Tacitus

Annals:

11.14 [193](#)

Tatian

Against the Hellenes:

41 [87](#)

Theopompos

(*FGrHist* 115)

Philippika

F43 [149](#);
F91 [115](#);
F136 [120](#);
F156 [113](#);
F279 [130](#);
F292 [162](#);
F307 [150](#)

Thucydides

1.2.5 [16](#);
1.3 [25](#);
1.4 [59](#);
1.8 [192](#);
1.20 [93](#);
1.89–117 [107](#);

1.95.7 [109](#);

1.97.2 [6](#), [32](#), [86](#);

1.100.1 [108](#);

1.100.2–3 [118](#);

1.101–3 [108–9](#), [184](#);

1.112.5 [113](#);

1.114 [113](#);

1.126.3–12 [87](#);

2.13 [119](#);

2.13.4–5 [133](#);

2.13.5 [118](#);

2.13.6–9 [123](#);

2.15.1 [20](#), [22](#), [31](#), [47](#), [72](#), [192](#), [214](#);

2.15.2 [53](#), [191](#);

2.15.4 [211](#);

2.17.1 [26](#), [197](#);

2.36.1 [16](#);

2.70.2 [119](#);

3.33.2 [171](#);

3.77.3 [171](#);

3.86.1 [124](#);

3.115.2–5 [124](#);

4.15.1–23.1 [124](#);

4.65.3 [124](#);

4.109.4 [196](#);

4.116.3 [122](#);

4.120–133 [125](#);

5.3.5 [126](#);

5.20.2–3 [86](#);

5.26.1 [132](#);

5.27 [126](#);

5.32.1 [125](#);

5.57.2 [186](#);

5.61.1–5.74.3 [127](#);

6.27–9 [129](#);

6.53–9 [93](#);

6.54.2 [92](#);

6.55.1 [91](#);

7.50.4 [131](#);

8.1 [132](#);

8.15.1 [133](#);

8.67.1 [132](#);

8.70.1 [132](#);

8.95.1 [190](#)

Timaios

(*FGrHist* 566):

F76 [174](#)

Tzetzes, Johannes

Antehomerica:

22 [64](#);

23 [64](#)

*Posthomeric*a:

Vita Aristotelis Marciana

p. 428 **155**

Xenagoras

(*FGrHist* 240):

F33 **179**

Xenophon

Hellenika:

1.3.1 **136**;

1.4.13 **135**;

1.6.24 **136**;

1.6.33–7.35 **137**;

1.7.2 **138**;

2.4.10–22 **140**;

2.4.19 **140**;

2.4.23–4 **140**;

3.5.7–16 **143**;

4.2.9–23 **143**;

4.2.18 **143**;

4.2.21 **143**;

4.5.11–18 **145**;

4.8.9–1010 **144**;

5.3.25–31 **146**;

6.2.1 **148**;

6.4 **148**;

7.4.22 **148**;

7.4.33 **148**;

7.4.36 **148**;

7.5.3 **148**;

7.5.24–5 **186**

Symposion:

4.17 **40**

INDEX OF NAMES

People, places and things The following words have not been indexed, because they are so pervasive: Athens, Athenians, Attika, the names of the individual Attidographers, Kastor of Rhodes, the *Marmor Parium*, Plutarch, Pausanias and Herodotos.

Accius [194](#)

Acropolis (at Athens) [21](#), [22](#), [28–9](#), [31](#), [45](#), [119](#), [133](#), [166–7](#), [172](#), [185](#), [197–8](#), [200–2](#), [216](#)

Adikion/adikema [110](#)

Admetos, of Pherai [70–1](#)

Adonis [199](#)

Adrastos [53](#), [54](#), [70–1](#)

adynatoi (handicapped) [188–9](#)

Aegean [81](#), [144](#), [149](#)

Africanus, *chronographiai* of [19](#)

Agamemnon [33](#), [73](#), [75–6](#);
wells of [177](#)

Agamestor, son of Thespies [83](#)

Agathokles, archon (357/6) [150](#)

Agathon, tragic poet [116](#)

Agra/Agrai, in Attika [175–6](#)

Aglaureion [201](#)

Aglauros/Agraulos: [62](#), [199–202](#), [203](#);
daughter of Kekrops [27–9](#), [33](#), [216](#);
priestess of [200](#);
wife of Kekrops [30](#)

Aggyrrhios [111–12](#)

Aiantidai [105](#)

Aiantis, Athenian tribe [105–6](#)

Aidoneus:
brother of Zeus [43](#), [68](#);
king of the Molossians [67–8](#)

Aietes [15](#)

Aigeis, Athenian tribe [50](#)

Aigeus, king of Athens [13](#), [50–1](#), [54](#), [207](#), [215](#);
son of Pandion II [14](#), [48–50](#)

Aigikoreis, Ionian tribe [47](#)

Aigina/Aiginetan(s) [14](#), [16](#), [88](#), [110–11](#), [178](#)

Aigisthos [33](#), [75](#)

Aigle [69](#)

Aigleis, daughter of Hyakinthos [215](#)

Ainiania/Ainianian(s) [164–5](#)

Aiolos, son of Hellen [79](#)

Aioria, Athenian ritual [211](#)

Airai/Airatan(s):
 in Hellespont 179;
 in Makedonia 179
 Aisimedes 83–4
 Aiskhines, orator 203
 Aiskhylos, son of Agamestor 83, 84;
 tragic poet 102, 205–7
 Aiskhraios, son of Polykles, of Anagyrous 185
 Aithaia/Aithean, in Lakonia 184
 Aitna, in Sicily 102
 Aithra, daughter of Pittheus, mother of Theseus 51, 54, 67–9, 73–4
 Aitolia/Aitolian(s) 55, 164–5;
 city in Lakonia 181
 Akademy 90–1, 156
 Akamantis, Athenian tribe 75, 98, 181
 Akamas, son of Theseus 73–7
 Akastos, son of Medon 82, 84
 Akestodoros 46
 Akhaia/Akhaian(s) 74, 78
 akhanas 184
 Akhilleus 69
 Akontion:
 in Arkadia 179;
 in Euboia 179
 Akontios, son of Lykaon 179
 Akousilaos (*FGrHist* 2) 18
 Aktaios 18–20, 31, 203
 Aktike/Akte 18, 20, 21, 31
 Alalkomenai 19
 Alexander I, king of Makedonia 130

Alexander III, king of Makedonia (the Great) 166–7, 193, 210
 Alexander Polyhistor (*FGrHist* 272) 18, 19
 Alexandros (Paris) 69
 Alkaios, archon (422/1) 122, 125–6
 Alkestis 70
 Alkibiades 129, 135, 171
 Alkippe, daughter of Ares 27, 33–4, 199
 Alkmaion 83–4
 Alkmaionidai 81, 87, 94–5, 97, 113
 Alkman, lyric poet 9
 Alope, daughter of Kerkyon 97
 Alopeke, Attic deme 98
 Alopekonnesos 149
 Amazon(s) 6, 53, 55, 59, 64–7, 205, 214
 Amazoneion 65
 Ameinias, archon (423/2) 126
 Amorgos/Amorgian(s) 150
Ammonias, sacred trireme 171
 Amphiaraios 70;
 sanctuary at Oropos 8
 Amphiktyon, son of Deukalion, king of Athens 14, 29, 31–2, 36–9, 207, 210–12
 Amphiktyon(s)/Amphiktyony(-ic) 36–9, 165;

Delphic 203
 Amphipolis/Amphipolitan(s) 76, 118, 150
 Amygdaleza 57
 Amynandridai, Athenian *genos* 22
 Amyntor 23
 Anakreon of Teos, lyric poet 93
 Anaxikrates, archon (307/6) 170, 172
 Anaximenes 159–60
 Andokides, son of Leogoras, of Kydathenaion 40, 116, 127–8, 145–6
 Androgeus, son of Minos 51, 58–60
 Androkles, son of Kodros 80
 Andron, of Halikarnassos 48
 Andropompos 79
 Ankyle, Attic deme 92
 Antalkidas (Antialkidas), the Lakonian 145, 147
 Antheis, daughter of Hyakinthos 215
 Anthela 37
Anthesteria, Athenian festival 76, 185
 Anthesterion, Athenian month 176
 Antigenes, archon (407/6) 135–6
 Antigone, daughter of Oidipous 70
Antigonis, sacred trireme 171
 Antigonis, Athenian tribe 171
 Antigonos Gonatas, king of Makedon 8
 Antigonos, the One-Eyed 170, 171, 173
 Antikles, archon (325/4) 165–6
 Antikythera mechanism 120
 Antiokhis, Athenian tribe 37, 91, 98
 Antiokhos 135
 Antiope, amazon 64–5, 67
 Antipater, regent of Makedon 166–7, 169–70
 Antiphemos, son of Eumolpos 46
 Antiphon, archon (418/17) 127
 Antiphon, orator 118, 175, 184
 Aones 21, 192
 Apatouria (Apatenoria), Athenian festival 77–9, 81
 Aphareus 151
 Apheidantidai, Athenian *genos* or phratry 78, 84
 Apeidas, son of Oxyntes, king of Athens 14, 77–8, 80–1
 Aphidna(i) 21, 67, 192, 212;
 Attic deme 52
 Aphidnos 67
 Aphrodision 102
 Aphrodite: 183;
 Heavenly (Ourania) 44, 51;
 in the Garden 202
 apobates 39, 41
 apodektai 97, 101
 Apollo: 17, 27, 29–30, 50–1, 94, 97, 154, 187, 203–4, 215, 217;
 Delphinios 56;
 Enyalios 217;
 the Golden 210;
 Kalydnean/Kalydnian 179;

Protector 155;
 Pythian 48;
 sanctuary on Delos 203
 Apollodoros 11;
Chronika of (*FGrHist* 244) 2, 156–7
 Apollodoros, archon (350/49) 153
Apostoleis/Apostoloi (Dispatchers/Dispatches) 186
 Apsandros 83
 Apseudes, archon (433/2) 119–20
 Ardettos 65
 Areiopagos/Areios Pagos/Areiopagites 11, 30, 32, 33–6, 66, 71, 75, 103–4, 110, 167–9, 199, 203, 205–8, 215
 Ares 15, 27, 30, 33–4, 205–7, 209
 Aretesion/Araterion 72
 Argennousa/Argennousian 178
 Arginousai islands 142;
 battle of 135–7
 Argos/Argive(s) 6, 71–2, 75–6, 82, 126, 143
 Ariadne 52, 57–8, 60–1, 69
 Arimaspians(s) 204
 Arimnestos, archon (416/15) 128
 Aripbron, son of Pherekles 83

Aristarkhos, Alexandrian scholar 84
 Aristodemos, archon (352/1) 152–3
 Aristodemos, grammarian 217
 Aristogeiton 165–6;
 tyrannicide 93, 96
 Aristokrates 137
 Ariston 87
 Aristophanes, Alexandrian scholar 89
 Aristotle: 11, 120, 132, 155–7, 169, 217;
Athenaion Politeia of 4–5, 7, 11, 35, 138
 Aristoxenos 156
 Arkadeis, Ionian tribe 47
 Arkadia/Arkadian(s) 14, 16, 148
 Arkesine/Arkesinean(s) 150
arkhe (empire) 109
 Arkhedemides, archon (464/3) 108
 Arkhelaos, king of Makedon 116, 130
 Arkhias, archon (346/5) 157
 Arkhias, Makedonian bounty-hunter 168
 Arkhias, son of Evagetos 83
 Arkhidamos, son of Zeuxidamos, king of Sparta 108, 122
 Arkhilokhos, lyric poet 84, 149–50, 187
 Arkhippos, son of Akastos 82, 85
Arrhēphoria, Athenian festival 201
 Artaphernes, nephew of Dareios 102
 Artaxerxes, king of Persia 148;
 Okhos 159–60
 Artemis: 26, 182–3, 204;
 Agraia 176;
 Agrotera 176;

Brauronia 198;
Kolainis 175;
Orthia 67;
Taurophoros/Tauropolos 182–3
Asia/Asia Minor 51, 81, 145, 173, 216
Asklepiades 176
Asopis 6
Assos 157
Athena: 15, 21—2, 27–8, 30, 41, 46–7, 55, 71, 90–1, 93, 103, 122, 128, 183, 194, 199–200;
City-holder 70;
contest with Poseidon 22, 46–7;
Pallas 75, 77, 168;
Pallenis 91;
Pandrosos 200;
Parthenos 66, 202;
Polias 46, 172, 200–201;
priestess of 44, 200;
Pronoia 204;
Skiras 45, 201, 217;
statue of 117–8
Athos, mt. 102
Atlantis 6
Atthis, daughter of Kranaos 31–2, 38
Aulis 19, 177, 183
autokhthon/autochthony 14–18, 20, 25, 29, 32, 39, 41, 46–7, 193

Babylon 167
Basile 81
Bisaltois 76
Boedromia, Athenian festival 44, 65, 217
Boedromion, Athenian month 65, 176, 187
Boiotia/Boiotian(s) 17, 21, 43, 48, 70–1, 79–80, 112, 122, 126, 142–3, 144, 146, 174, 192, 214
Boliskos/Bolissos 181
Boreas, son of Astraïos, of Thrace 43, 215
Bosporos, Kimmerian 64, 66
Bottiaia/Bottiaian(s) 154
Boule (Council) 98, 100, 134, 144, 168, 189
Bouleuterion 98
Bouphonia, Athenian festival 178, 195
Boutes, eponymous hero 42, 46–7, 215
Boutes, of Phlya 155
Bouzyges, eponymous hero 21, 46, 194
Bouzygai, Athenian *genos* 194
Brasidas, Spartan commander 123, 125
Brauron/Brauronian(s) 21, 24, 26, 192, 198
Brese/Brise 180
Briareus 17
Byzantion/Byzantine(s) 135, 151, 162–3

Centaur(s) 53, 66
Ceres, *see* Demeter;

queen of the Siculi [46](#), [68](#)
Corinth/Corinthian(s) *see* [Korinth/Korinthian\(s\)](#)
Crete/Krete/Cretan(s)/Kretan(s) [43](#), [57–61](#), [63](#), [68](#)
Cyclades [216](#)
Cyprus *see* [Kypros](#)

Daeira [183](#)
Daidalos [34](#), [49](#), [57](#), [60](#), [205–7](#)
Danaïs [14](#), [36](#)
Dardanos [15](#)
Dareios, king of Persia [96](#)
Datis, Persian general [102](#)
Daton/Datenes [149–50](#)
Deinarkhos, orator [40](#), [97](#), [151–2](#), [160](#), [167](#), [170](#), [172–3](#), [180](#)
Deiope, daughter of Triptolemos [46](#)
Deipnophoria, Athenian festival [62](#), [201](#)
Deipnophoroi [62–3](#)
Dekeleia [21](#)
Delos/Delian(s) [9](#), [29–30](#), [181–2](#), [203–4](#), [217](#)

Delphi: [37](#), [51](#), [80](#), [90](#), [94–5](#), [97](#), [112–13](#), [128](#), [153–4](#);
Pythais to [8](#)
Delphinion, homicide court [76](#)
Delphousia, in Arkadia [178](#)
Demades, son of Demeas, of Paiania [8](#)
deme(s)/demarch [97](#), [100](#), [157–8](#)
Demeter: [42–3](#), [46–7](#), [70](#), [128](#), [153](#), [175–6](#), [177](#), [183](#), [211](#), [213–14](#), [217](#);
Khloe [185](#)
Demetrias, sacred trireme [171](#)
Demetrias, Athenian tribe [171](#)
Demetron, Athenian month [171](#)
Demetrios Poliorketes [170](#), [171–3](#), [176](#)
Demetrios, son of Phanostratos, of Phaleron [168–172](#), [190](#)
Demokhares, nephew of Demosthenes [170](#)
Demokritos, of Naxos [103–4](#)
Demophon, son of Theseus, king of Athens [14](#), [33](#), [71](#), [73–77](#), [207](#)
demosios (public slave) [189](#)
Demosthenes, orator [7](#), [112](#), [141](#), [147](#), [151](#), [155](#), [162–4](#), [165](#), [166–8](#), [172](#), [183](#)
Deukalion [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [30](#), [32](#), [36–9](#), [79](#), [193](#)
Deukalion, son of Minos [57](#)
Deukalioneia [6](#), [193](#)
diaitetai (arbitrators) [121](#)
diapsephsis/diapsephismos [114](#), [157](#)
didaskalia [114](#), [125](#), [133](#)
Didymos, Alexandrian scholar [10](#), [127](#), [131](#), [146](#), [151](#), [157](#), [161](#), [163–4](#), [165](#), [179](#),
[183](#), [188](#)
Diakria [49](#)
Dikaiarkhos [155](#)
Dikaiarkhos of Messene [40](#)
Diognetos, Athenian archon [20](#)
Diognetos, son of Megakles [82](#)
Diokles, archon (409/8) [133](#)
Diomedes [76](#)

Diomedon, Athenian commander 137
 Dionysia, Athenian festival 112, 211
 Dionysios, author of *kyklos* 73
 Dionysios of Halikarnassos 10, 151, 157, 163–4, 165
 Dionysos/Dionysiac: 36–7, 39, 45, 61–2, 123, 180, 187, 210–12, 217;
 Bakkheutas 182;
 Bromios 182;
 Dithyrambos 182;
 Euanthes 182;
 Hyes 177;
 in Limnais/Limnaios 182, 211;
 Orthos 211;
 son of Semele 210–211
 Diopeithes:
 the Lokrian 82:
 mercenary commander 160
 Diophantos, archon (395/4) 112, 142–3
 Dioskouroi (Kastor and Polydeukes) 66, 68, 74
 Diotimes, archon (428/7) 123, 156
 Diotimos, archon (354/3) 151
 Diotrephe, archon (384/3) 156
 Dipolieia, Athenian festival 178
 Dodona 204
 Dolopia/Dolopian(s) 164–5
 Doric/Dorian(s) 25, 79, 104
 Dorieus, son of Damagetos, of Rhodes 142
 Doros, son of Hellen 79
 Drakon, Athenian lawgiver 3, 11, 76–7, 87–8, 208

Egypt/Egyptian(s) 6, 21, 148, 182, 191
 Eileithyia 30, 176
 Eirene (Peace), altar of 147–8
eisangelia (impeachment) 150, 189–90
eisphora (capital-levy) 146–7
 Elateia 164
 Elephenor, son of Khalkodon 73–4
 Eleusios, father of Triptolemos 45
 Eleusis/Eleusinian(s) 19, 21, 42–3, 45–7, 48, 55, 80, 96, 172, 175, 177, 192, 200, 213–4, 216–7
 Eleutherai 211
 Elis/Eleian(s) 117–8, 126, 216
 Elpines, archon (356/5) 150
 Embata, battle 151
 Endios, Spartan ephor 133, 135
 Ennea Hodoi (Nine Ways) 76, 118
 Epakria 21, 37, 192
 Epameinondas 186
 Epeiros 67
 ephebe(s) 120–21, 200
 Ephesos 78
ephetai (homicide judges) 75, 208
 Ephialtes: 11, 104, 112, 168;
 reforms of 109–110, 206

Ephialtes, general for the homeguard [153](#)
 Ephoros [39](#), [95](#), [103](#), [107–8](#), [118–19](#), [163](#)
 Epikaste *see* Iokaste
 Epikharmos, poet [187–8](#)
 Epikrates, of Kephisia [145](#)
epitaphios (funeral oration) [6](#), [16](#), [17](#), [66](#), [71](#)
epopteus/epoptai (initiates) [172](#)
 Erasinides, Athenian general [137](#)

Eratosthenes, Alexandrian scholar [8](#), [13](#), [24](#), [84](#), [167](#)
 Erekhtheidai [77](#)
 Erekhtheion [22](#), [46](#), [199](#)
 Erekhtheis, Athenian tribe [46](#)
 Erekhtheus/Erekhtheid(s): [15](#), [16](#), [27](#), [29](#), [31](#), [35](#), [39–41](#), [42–47](#), [49](#), [55](#), [200](#), [207](#), [209](#), [213–17](#);
 dynasty [13](#), [78](#);
 son of Pandion [14](#)
 Eretria/Eretrian(s) [161](#)
 Erexios [83](#)
 Erigone, daughter of Aigisthos [33](#), [75](#);
 daughter of Ikarios [211](#)
 Erikhthonios:
 son of Athena and Hephaistos, king of Athens [14](#), [16](#), [31–2](#), [38](#), [47](#), [200](#), [207](#);
 birth of [22](#) [199](#), [201](#);
 daughters of Kekrops and [28–9](#);
 Panathenaia and [39–42](#)
 Erinyes [205–6](#)
 Erkhia:
 sacred calendar of [18](#)
 Eros [90–1](#)
 Erxikleides, archon (548/7) [94](#)
 Erysikhthon:
 son of Kekrops [22](#), [29–30](#), [203–4](#);
 son of Triopas, of Thessaly [30](#)
 Erysikhthonidai, Athenian *genos* [29](#)
 Erythrai [78](#), [151](#)
 Eteoboutadai, Athenian *genos* [45](#)
 Eteokles, son of Oidipous [70](#)
 Evandros, archon (382/1) [146](#)
 Euboia/Euboian(s) [48](#), [73–4](#), [113](#), [114](#), [125](#), [151](#), [161](#), [204](#)
 Euboulides, archon (394/3) [141](#);
 of Eleusis [145](#)
 Euboulos [112](#), [169](#), [189](#)
 Eudoxos, mathematician [156](#)
 Eukleides, archon (404/3) [92–3](#)
 Eukles, archon (427/6) [123](#)
 Euktemon, archon (408/7) [135](#)
 Eumenides [33](#), [44](#), [65](#), [205](#)
 Eumolpidai, *genos* from Eleusis [46](#), [96](#), [175](#), [214](#)
 Eumolpos, of Eleusis [27](#), [43](#), [46–7](#), [55](#), [214–6](#);
 king of Thrace [47](#), [214–5](#);
 son of Poseidon [44](#)
 Eupatridai/Eupatrid(s) [34](#), [86](#), [127](#)

Euphorion 119
Eupolis, comic poet 131, 185
Euripides, tragic poet 9, 71, 97, 215–7;
 Erechtheus of 214–5
Europe 66
Eurymedon, Athenian general 124
Eurymedon river:
 battle of 107, 111, 128
Eurysakeion 98
Eusebios (Hieronymus) 30, 59, 213
Euthykles, archon (398/7) 140
Euthymenes, archon (437/6) 118, 119
Euthynos, archon (426/5) 123–4
Euxine 64
exegetes(-ai) 4, 7

Five Thousand 134
Four Hundred 134;
 revolution of 132

Galeoi 184
Galepsos 149
Gamelia 183
Gargettos, Attic deme 54–5, 216
Ge (Earth-goddess) 16, 17, 177
Geleontes, Ionian tribe 47
Genesia, Athenian festival
genos/gene/gennetai 18, 22, 29, 47, 60, 63, 78, 81, 184–5, 194, 199, 212
Geraistos:
 promontory 99;
 grave of 215
Glauke, daughter of Kreon 44
Glauketes Athenaios 116
Glaukippos, archon (410/09) 134
Glaukon, from Kerameis 116, 127–8
Gorgon:
 head of 103
Graces 156–7
grammateus:
 of the *Boule* 189;
 of the *Dioikesis* 189
Great King (of Persia): 142, 145, 147, 159–60, 162;
 Peace of (387/6) 148
Gresinos/Gresinian(s) 179
Grupanion 184
Gyges 17
gynaikonomoi 169

Habron, archon (458/7) 110
Hades' 68, 69, 72
Hagnias 140–1
Hagnous, Attic deme 55
Haimon 174

Halikarnassos/Halikarnassian(s) 178
 Halirrhotos, son of Poseidon 27, 30, 33–4, 205, 207
 Harma 70–1
 Harmodios, tyrannicide 92–3, 96
 Harpaktides, archon (511/10) 96
 Harpalos 166–7
hegemonia (leadership) 109
 Hekale/Hekaline/*Hekalesia* 56, 62
 Hekataios (*FGrHist* 1) 25–6, 28, 66, 196
 Hekatombaion, Athenian month 42, 194

 Hektor 69
 Helen, daughter of Tyndareus, of Sparta 52, 66, 67, 69, 73–4
heliakai (age-group heroes) 121
 Helikon 176
 Hellen, son of Deukalion 36, 79
Hellenika Oxyrhynchia 134, 138
 Hellespont 102, 137, 150, 154, 160
 Helot(s) 108
 Hephaisteion 98
 Hephaistos 14, 22, 24, 32, 41, 46, 183
 Hera:
 Priestesses of, at Argos 6
 Herakleion (-a) 68, 105
 Herakleidai: 71, 79–80;
 return of 16, 78, 84
 Herakles 52, 56, 63–5, 68–70, 71, 82, 104, 177
 Herculaneum: *villa dei papyri* at 157
 Hermeias of Atarneus 187
 Hermes: 27, 127–8;
 by the gate 143–4;
 Trikephalos 92
 Hermippos:
 of Kyzikos 170;
 of Smyrna 21, 193–4
 Hermokopidai 129–30
 Herm(s): 93, 128–30;
 mutilation of 128–9
 Herse 27–9, 62, 199, 210
Hersephoria *see* *Arrhephoria*
 Hesiod 19
 Hestia 177
 Hestiaia/Hestiaian(s) 113
 Hierokleides 153
 Hieron 162
 hierophant 175
 Himeraios, brother of Demetrios, of Phaleron 170
 Hipparkhos:
 son of Kharmos 98;
 son of Peisistratos 55, 90–94, 96–7, 98, 182;
 tyrant of Eretria 98
 Hippasos 70
 Hippe 69

Hippias, son of Peisistratos [90–92](#), [94–5](#), [97](#)
 Hippodamos, archon (375/4) [147](#)
 Hippokleides [40](#)
 Hippokrates [66](#)
 Hippolyta, amazon [65](#)
 Hippolyte [69](#)
 Hippolytos [182](#)
 Hippomakhos [140](#)
 Hippomenes [83–5](#)
 Hippothontis, Athenian tribe [78](#)
 Hippothoon:
 Eleusinian hero [97](#);
 son of Poseidon [99–100](#)
 Homer [19](#), [24](#), [39](#), [82](#), [84](#), [180–1](#), [183](#)
 homogalaktes [184–5](#)
 Hopletes, Ionian tribe [47](#)
 Horai (Seasons) [37](#), [210–211](#)
 Horkomosion [65](#)
 Hyad(s) [216](#)
 Hyakinthos/Hyakinthides [43](#), [47](#), [51](#), [215](#)
 Hymettos [32](#)
 Hyperbolos, son of Antiphanes [99](#), [101](#), [127](#), [134](#)
 Hyperboreas/Hyperborean(s) [204](#)
 Hypereides, orator [62](#), [98](#), [143](#), [167](#), [172](#), [203–4](#)

Ialysos [142](#)
 Iambe:
 daughter of Pan and Echo [45](#);
 jest of [214](#)
 Iaones *see* Iones/Ionian(s)
 Ikaria, Attic deme [212](#)
 Ikarios [211–12](#)
 Ilion (Troy) [73](#)
 Ilissos, river [176](#)
 Immarados, son of Eumolpos, of Thrace [215](#)
 India [167](#)
 Indus [210](#)
 Imbros, island [24](#)
 Iokaste, mother of Oidipous [70](#)
 Ion, son of Xouthos [31](#), [43](#), [44](#), [47](#), [215–7](#)
 Iones/Ionia/Ionian(s)/Ionic [31](#), [43](#), [48–50](#), [78–80](#), [82](#), [84](#), [192](#), [216–7](#)
 Ionidai, Attic deme [216](#)
 Iphigeneia [182–3](#)
 Iphikrates, Athenian general [144–5](#), [150](#), [151](#)
 Ipsos, battle of [173](#)
 Isarkhos, archon (424/3) [114](#), [122](#), [125–6](#)
 Ismene, daughter of Oidipous [70](#)
 Isokrates [109](#), [155–7](#), [208](#)
 Issedones [204](#)
 Isthmia/Isthmian: [53](#), [63](#);
 Games [63](#)
 Isthmos (Isthmus), of Korinth [48–50](#)
 Itea/Iteaian(s) [181](#)

Jason [44](#), [52](#), [57](#), [60](#)
Josephos, historian [19](#)
Jupiter (Zeus) [21](#)

Kadmeia, acropolis of Thebes [36](#), [70](#), [146](#)
Kadmos [15](#), [16](#), [36](#)

kados [188](#)

Kaikilios, of Kaleacte [189](#)

Kalauria (Poros), island [168](#)

Kalliades, archon (480/79) [102](#)

Kallias:

from Angele, archon (406/5) [136](#)–[7](#);

from Skambonidai, archon (412/11) [132](#)–[3](#);

Peace of [111](#);

son of Hipponikos [145](#)

Kallimakhos, Alexandrian scholar [1](#), [56](#)

Kallimakhos, archon (446/5) [113](#)

Kallimakhos, of Pergase, archon (349/8) [3](#), [153](#)–[5](#)

Kallimedes, archon (360/59) [149](#)–[50](#)

Kallippic cycle [120](#)

Kallippos, astronomer [120](#)

Kallisto, priestess [74](#)

Kallistratos: [119](#);

of Akharnai [116](#);

of Aphidna [145](#);

archon (355/4) [150](#)–[1](#)

Kallynteria, Athenian festival [200](#)

Kalydna/Kalydnaian(s) [179](#)

Kalydnos, son of Ouranos [179](#)

Kalypso [19](#)

Kantharos [102](#)

Kapai/Kapaian(s) [178](#)

Kardia [160](#)

Karia/Karian(s) [21](#), [192](#)

Karkhedon/Karkhedonian(s) [42](#)

Karystos [204](#)

Kassander, son of Antipater [169](#)–[70](#), [171](#)

katatome (profile) [185](#)

Kebris, archon [92](#)–[3](#)

Kaunos [142](#)

Kekropia/Kekropian(s) [18](#), [20](#), [21](#), [31](#)–[2](#), [54](#), [192](#)

Kekropidai, daughters of Kekrops [30](#)–[1](#), [41](#), [199](#), [202](#), [203](#)

Kekropis, Athenian tribe [98](#), [190](#)

Kekrops, king of Athens: [11](#), [13](#), [16](#), [18](#), [20](#)–[23](#), [25](#), [30](#)–[1](#), [47](#), [62](#), [83](#), [175](#), [191](#)–[5](#), [198](#), [199](#)–[201](#), [203](#), [207](#);

daughters of [27](#)–[9](#);

Diphyes (Two-formed) [14](#), [20](#)–[1](#), [83](#);

son-in-law of Aktaios [20](#);

tomb of [46](#)

Kekrops II, king of Athens [14](#), [47](#)–[8](#), [207](#)

Keleos, king of Eleusis [45](#)

Kephalos:
 son of Deioneus [34](#), [205–7](#), [209](#), [215](#);
 son of Hermes [199](#)
 Kephisia [21](#)
 Kephisodotos:
 Athenian general [149–50](#);
 sculptor [148](#)
 Kephisophon, Athenian general [161](#)
 Kerameikos [182](#)
 Kerameis, Attic deme [98](#)
 Keramos, hero [98](#)
 Kerberos [67–8](#)
 Kerkyon [54](#), [69](#), [99](#)
 Kerkyra/Kerkyraian(s) [128](#)
 Kersebleptes [150](#), [160](#)
 Keryx/Kerykes [27](#), [46](#), [127–8](#), [199](#)
 Khabrias:
 archon [129–30](#);
 Athenian general [144–5](#), [156–7](#)
 Khaironeia [8](#), [193](#)
 Khalkeia, Athenian festival [183](#)
 Khalkidian(s):
 in Euboea [161](#);
 in Thrace [154](#)
 Khalkiope:
 daughter of Khalkodon [69](#);
 daughter of Rhexenor [50](#)
 Khalkodon, hero [65](#), [73](#)
 Khares, Athenian general [151](#), [154](#), [162–3](#)
 Kharias, archon (415/4) [128](#), [130](#)
 Kharidemos, mercenary commander [154](#)
 Kharmides, son of Glaukon [140](#)
 Kharmos [90–1](#)
 Kharops [83](#)
 Khione [214–5](#)
 Khios/Khian(s) [79](#), [151](#)
Khoes (jugs), Athenian festival [75–6](#)
 Khoirilos [116](#)
 Khremonidean War [8](#), [170](#)
 Khthonia, daughter of Erekhtheus [43](#), [215](#)
 Khytrinoi (contest of comedians) [185](#)
 Khytroi (pots), Athenian festival [185](#)
 Kilix, eponym of Kilikia [36](#)
 Kimon/Kimonian, Athenian general [8](#), [23](#), [53](#), [66](#), [108–9](#), [111](#), [187](#), [191](#)
 King, the *see* Great King
 Kirrha/Kirrhan(s) [113](#)
 Kition [111](#)
 Klazomenai [78](#)
 Klearkhos [193](#)
 Kleidikos, son of Aisimedes [83–4](#)
 Kleisthenes/Kleisthenic [3](#), [11](#), [22](#), [31](#), [41](#), [42](#), [46](#), [50](#), [53](#), [54](#), [75](#), [87](#), [97–101](#), [171](#),
[192](#), [212](#)
 Kleisthenes of Sikyon [113](#)

Kleitarkhos, tyrant of Eretria [161](#), [163](#)
 Kleitophon, of Thorai [116](#)
 Kleokritos, archon (413/12) [131](#)
 Kleomenes, king of Sparta [94](#)
 Kleon, Athenian general [123–7](#), [134](#)
 Kleophon, politician [133–4](#)
kleroterion [134](#)
 kleroukh(s) [153](#), [160](#)

Klytaimnestra, daughter of Tyndareus [33](#), [75](#)
 Knidos [141](#), [144](#)
 Knossos [57](#), [60](#)
 Kodridai [80](#), [84–5](#)
 Kodros, king of Athens [50](#), [78–81](#)
 Kolainos [175](#)
 kolakretes/kolakretai [89–90](#), [98](#), [101](#)
 Kollytos, Attic deme [91](#), [155](#)
 Kolonetai [98](#)
 Kolonos, Attic deme [98](#), [119](#)
 Kolonos Hippeus [70](#)
 Kolophon [79](#)
 Komeas, archon (560/59) [87](#), [90](#)
 Konon, archon (462/1) [110](#)
 Konon, son of Timotheos, Athenian general [141–2](#), [144](#)
 Kore *see* Persephone
 Korinth/Korinthian(s) [63](#), [126](#), [128–9](#), [143–4](#),
 Koroibos, archon (306/5) [171](#)
 Koroibos, Elean athlete [83](#)
 Koroneia [143](#)
 Kottos [17](#)
 Kotys, king of Thrace [149–50](#)
 Koukounari [57](#)
 Kourotrophos [200–201](#)
 Kranae, daughter of Kranaos [31](#)
 Kranaekhme, daughter of Kranaos [31](#)
 Kranaoi (‘men of the heights’) [30–2](#)
 Kranaos, king of Athens [13](#), [14](#), [22](#), [29](#), [30–2](#), [33](#), [36](#), [38](#), [193](#), [207](#)
 Krates [44](#)
 Kratinos, comic poet [129](#)
 Kratinos, of Sphettos [145](#)
 Kratippos, historian [130](#)
 Krenides [150](#)
 Kreon, archon (684/3) [11](#), [83–4](#), [86](#)
 Kreon, king of Thebes, [44](#)
 Kreon, of Skambonidai [116](#)
 Kreon, ruler of Thebes [70](#)
 Kreousa, daughter of Erekhtheus [43](#), [47](#), [215–6](#)
 Kreousa, daughter of Kreon of Korinth [44](#)
 Krepis [190](#)
 Krete *see* Crete
 Kritias [139–140](#)
 Krommyonia [48](#)
Kronia, Athenian festival [194](#)

Kronos [23](#), [194](#)
Kropeis/Kropia, Attic deme [181](#)
Kroton (Cortona), in Italy [23](#), [196](#)
Kybernesia, Athenian festival [58](#), [62](#)
Kydathenaion, Attic deme [127](#)
kyllestis (sour bread) [182](#)
Kylon/Kylonian(s) [11](#), [87](#)
Kypros (Cyprus) [6](#), [75](#), [111](#), [141](#), [188](#)
Kytheros [21](#)
Kytinion [164](#)

Labyrinth [57–7](#), [61](#)
Laevius [188](#)
Lakedaimon/Lakedaimonian(s) [33](#), [48](#), [108](#), [112–3](#), [117](#), [122](#), [124](#), [126](#), [133](#), [135](#),
[141–3](#), [144–5](#), [206](#), [215](#)
Lakhares, Athenian politician [137](#)
Lakhes, Athenian general [122–4](#), [127](#)
Lakonia/Lakonian(s) [48](#), [179](#)
Lakrateides, archon [96](#)
Lakrateides, hierophant [153](#)
Lamian War [9](#), [169](#)
Lampides, of Peiraieus [116](#)
Lamptrai, Attic deme [32](#)
Laodike, daughter of Priam [76](#)
Lapith(s) [53](#)
Latium [23](#)
Laureion [93–4](#), [212](#)
Lawcourts (*dikasteria*) in Athens:
 Greater [181](#);
 Heliaia [181](#);
 Kallion [181](#);
 Lykos' [181](#);
 Metiokhos' [181](#);
 Middle [181](#);
 Stuffed in [181](#);
 Triangular [181](#)
League/Confederacy:
 Aitolian [148](#);
 Amphiktyonic [37–9](#);
 Boiotian [143](#);
 Second Athenian [147–8](#)
Lebedos [79](#)
Leipsydriion, fort [95](#)
Lemnos/Lemnian(s) [24–6](#), [165](#), [197](#)
Leobotes, son of Alkmaion [189](#)
Leokoreion [54](#), [182](#)
Leokrates [83](#)
Leontis, Athenian tribe [54](#), [181](#)
Leos, of Hagnous:
 herald [54](#);
 daughters of [55](#)
Lesbos/Lesbian(s) [81](#)
Leto [204](#)

Leukonoion, Attic deme [119](#)
 Leuktra, battle of [148](#)
 Limone, daughter of Hippomenes [85](#)
 Lokris/Lokrian(s) [165](#)
 Long Walls, at Athens [144](#)
 Loryma [141](#)
 Lydia/Lydian(s) [88](#)
 Lykabettos [28](#)
 Lykeion [65](#), [120](#), [155](#)
 Lykia/Lykian(s) [51](#)
 Lykiskos, archon (344/3) [159](#)

Lykos, son of Pandion II [48–9](#), [51](#)
 Lykourgos, son of Lykophron, of Boutadai, [8](#), [97](#), [98](#), [137](#), [169](#), [171](#), [176](#), [215](#)
 Lynkeus, of Thrace [45](#)
 Lysander, Spartan commander [135](#)
 Lysandros, of Sikyon, kitharist [92–3](#)
 Lysias, Athenian commander [137](#)
 Lysimakhides, archon (445/4) [114](#)
 Lysimakhides, of Akharnai, archon (339/8) [164](#)
 Lytaia, daughter of Hyakinthos [215](#)

Magnesia [152](#)
 Makar [180](#)
 Makedon/Makedonian(s) [130](#), [161](#), [167](#), [169](#)
 Maleus/Malian(s) *or* Maleates [178](#)
 Mantinea, battle of: (418/17) [124](#), [127](#);
 (362/1) [186](#)
 Marathon/Marathonian(s) [56](#), [66](#), [91](#), [152](#), [181](#);
 battle of [102–3](#);
 sacred
 calendar of [18](#)
 Mardonios, Persian general [102](#)
 Maroneia [103](#), [149–50](#)
 Medeia, wife of Aigeus [69](#)
 Medon/Medontid(s):
 dynasty of [78–82](#)
 Medontidai [78](#), [81](#), [84](#)
 Megakles [82](#), [84](#)
 Megara/Megaris/Megarian(s): [48–50](#), [51](#), [104](#), [153–4](#), [170](#);
 Decree(s) [117–18](#)
 Megillos, Spartan ambassador [135](#)
 Melania [150](#)
 Melanippeion [176](#)
 Melanippides [116](#), [177](#)
 Melanippos, son of Theseus [176](#)
 Melanthos/Melanthid(s): [77–81](#);
 dynasty of [13](#), [78](#), [80](#)
 Meliboia [69](#)
 Melikertes [63](#)
 Melite:
 Attic deme [98](#), [176](#);
 daughter of Hoples [69](#);

daughter of Myrmex/Dios 98
Menander, comic poet 183, 186
Mende 125
Menelaos 73, 133
Menesthes 58
Menestheus, Athenian general 151
Menestheus, king of Athens 14;
son of Peleos 73–4
Menippe 23
Merope, daughter of Erekhtheus 57
Mesogaia 55
Messene/Messenian(s) 79, 198
Meta, daughter of Hoples 50
Metakhoion/Metakhoiate(s) 179
Metaneira, queen of Eleusis 45
Methone 150
Methouriades/Methouriean(s) 178
Metionidai, Athenian *genos* 49
Meton, astronomer 119–20
Metonic cycle 119–20
Miletos 78
Miltiades 25–6, 197–8
Miltokythes 149–50
Mindaros, Spartan commander 133
Minoa/Minoitan(s) 150
Minos, king of Crete 50–1, 57–61, 192, 215
Minotaur 27, 52–3, 57–61, 62–3
Mnesikles, architect 119
Molon, archon (362/1) 149
Molossia 68
Molpaidia 67
Molpis 139–40
moriai (sacred olive trees) 122
Mother Goddess 176–7
Mounitos 76
Mounykhia/Munykhia/Mounikhia: 170–1, 174–5, 198;
battle of 140
Mounykhos, son of Pantakles 174–5
Mousaios 43, 46, 214
Mouseion 64–5, 155–6
Muses 44
Mykenai/Mykenaian(s) 81, 197–8
Myous 79
Myron, of Phlya 87
Myrrhine 90–1
Myrrhinous, Attic deme 175
Myrsilos (*FGrHist* 477) 23, 196–7
Mysteries (of Demeter and Persephone): 172–3, 175, 199, 211, 213;
Greater 176;
Lesser, at Agrai 175–6;
Profanation of 128–9
mystes/mystai 172

naukraria/naukrary/naukraries 90, 97, 101
naukraros/naukraroi 97
Nausigenes, archon (368/7) 156
Nausinikos, archon (378/7) 146
Nausikles, Athenian general 152
Nausithoos 58
Naxos/Naxian(s) 103–4
Neleus/Neleion 78–81
Nemea 54, 143
Nemesis, temple at Rhamnous 47

Neon/Neones/Neosi 179
nikai (golden) 136–7
Nikaia 164–5
Nikander 45, 182–3, 214
Nikeratos, epic poet 116
Nikeratos, son of Nikias 8
Nikias, son of Nikeratos 122, 131;
 Peace of 126
Nikomakhos, archon (341/0) 161–3
Nikophanes, archon (361/60) 149
Nikostratos, Athenian general 127
Nisaia 48
Nisos, son of Pandion II 48–9, 51
nomophylakes 110, 169
nomos eisangeltikos 190
nomothesia 89–90
Nymphs: 37, 44, 182;
 Sphragis 105–6

Odysseus 128
Ogygos: 18–20, 83;
 antediluvian
 personality 20;
 king of Ektenes 19
Oidipous 44, 53, 70–1
Oie:
 Attic deme 99;
 daughter of Kephalos 99
Oineis, Athenian tribe 186
Oinoe, Attic deme 79, 181, 212
Oinous, fortress 180
Oion, Attic deme 99, 179
Okeanos 43, 68
Olympia/Olympic/Olympiad(s) 9, 18, 21, 63, 83, 84, 86, 87–8, 117–18, 142, 156
Olynthos/Olynthian(s) 2, 146, 154–5, 162, 164
Onomakritos 180
Onomarkhos, mercenary commander 152
Ophryneion 178
Ops (Rhea) 21
Orcus, king of the Molossians 68
Oreithyia, daughter of Erekhtheus 43, 215
Orestes 33–4, 71, 75–6, 205–7

Oreus/Oreitan(s) 161
orgeones 184
Orkhomenos 174
Orneai 127
Orneus, son of Pandion II 49–50
Oropos 8
Orpheus/Orphic 17, 42, 43, 180, 214
Orthaia, daughter of Hyakinthos 215
Ortygia 29
Oskhophoria, festival at Athens 61–3, 217
oskhophoroi 62
ostracism/ostracized 99–101, 103, 115
ostrakon/ostraka/ostrakophoria 99, 100, 127
Othreis 79
Ouranos 17
Oxyntes, son of Demophon, king of Athens 14, 77

Paionia, Attic deme 91
Palladion 65, 75–7
Pallantidai, sons of Pallas 50–1, 54–5
Pallas, son of Pandion II 48–9, 50, 54–5
Pallene/Pallenean(s):
 Attic deme 55, 91;
 in Thrace 154
Panakton, fort 79, 126
Panathenaia (Athenaia)/Panathenaic 39–42
Pandia, Athenian festival 42
Pandion I, son of Erikhthonios, king of Athens 14, 42, 213
Pandion II, king of Athens 14, 48–50, 72, 76, 207
Pandionis, Athenian tribe 42
Pandora, daughter of Erekhtheus 43, 216
Pandroseion 46, 172, 199
Pandrosos 27–9, 46, 62, 199–201
Panhellenic/Panhellenism/Panhellenist(s) 37–9, 63, 109, 216
Panionia 79
Paralia 49, 55
Paralos, sacred trireme 152, 171
parasitoi 177
Parparon/Parparonian *or* Parparoniotai 178
Parthenoi/Hyakinthides 43, 215
Parthenon: 119, 202;
 frieze 41;
 metopes 66
Pasiphae, wife of Minos 58–9, 61
Patroklos 69
Peace:
 of Nikias 122–3;
 Thirty Years' 122
Pedias, wife of Kranaos 31
Pegai 175
Pegasos, of Eleutherai 211
Peiraieus 65, 102–3, 139–40, 143–4, 171, 174–5
Peirithous 67–9

Peisandros, Athenian politician [132](#)
 Peisandros, Spartan navarch [141](#)
 Peisias [129–130](#)
 Peisistratos/Peisistratidai/Peisistratid(s) [11](#), [53](#), [81](#), [87](#), [90–94](#), [96–7](#), [98](#), [120](#), [131](#), [198](#), [213](#), [217](#)

 Pelargi/Pelargikon/Pelasgikon [23](#), [24](#), [26](#), [196–7](#)
 Pelasgians [23–6](#), [196–8](#)
 Pelasgos [23](#)
 Pella [130](#)
 Pellene [28](#)
 Peloponnese/Peloponnesian(s) [48](#), [50](#), [67](#), [78](#), [81](#), [142–3](#), [216](#)
 Peloponnesian War [7](#), [9](#), [11](#), [107](#), [118–9](#), [121–2](#), [139](#), [188](#)
 pentaploa [45](#)
 Pentekontaetia [107](#), [109](#), [111](#)
 Pentelikon, mount [56](#), [216](#)
 Penthilos, son of Boros [79](#)
 Perdikkas II, king of Makedon [130](#)
 Periandros, law of [147](#)
 Perigoune, daughter of Sinis [176](#)
 Perikleidas [108](#)
 Perikles, of Kolargos [11](#), [16](#), [112–118](#), [120](#), [185](#)
 Perikles, Athenian general [137](#)
 Periklymenos, son of Neleus [79](#)
 Perinthos/Perinthian(s) [162–4](#)
 Peripatos [156](#)
 peristoikhoi [188](#)
 Persephone [42–3](#), [47](#), [52](#), [67–9](#), [153](#), [213](#), [217](#)
 Persia/Persian(s): [6](#), [43](#), [56](#), [66](#), [102](#), [104](#), [105](#), [108](#), [184](#), [214](#);
 satraps [163](#);
 Wars [102–6](#), [107](#)
 Phaiax [58](#)
 Phaidra [69](#)
 Phainippides (Phainippos), archon (490/89) [102](#)
 Phaleron [58](#), [65](#), [75–7](#), [217](#)
 Pharnabazos, Persian satrap [141](#), [144–5](#)
 Pharsalos/Pharsalian(s) [116](#)
 Phayllos, Phokian commander [152](#)
 Pheidias, sculptor [117–8](#)
 Pheidon, king of Argos [82](#)
 Pheidostrate [200](#)
 Phereboia [69](#)
 Pherekles, son of Diognetos [82](#)
 Phereklos [58](#)
 Pherekrates, comic poet [187](#)
 Pherekydes (*FGrHist* 3) [26](#), [60](#)
 Philaidai/Philaid(s), Athenian *genos* [25](#), [40](#)
 Philip II, king of Makedon [2](#), [113](#), [149–50](#), [151–2](#), [154–5](#), [159–165](#), [203](#)
 Philippoi/Philippi [149–50](#)
 Philippos, archon (292/1) [159](#), [172](#), [172](#)
 Philiskos, archon (448/7) [112](#)
 Philistides, tyrant of Oreus [161](#), [163](#)
 Philodemos [155–7](#)

Philokharidas, Spartan ambassador [135](#)
 Philokles, of Anaphlystos, archon (392/1) [145](#)
 Philokles, archon (322/1) [156](#), [167](#)
 Philokrates, decree of [153](#)
 Philokrates, of Hagnous:
 Peace of [139](#), [159–60](#), [162](#)
 Philomela [42](#)
 Philon, architect:
 arsenal of [164](#)
 Philon, historian [19](#)
 Phleious [19](#)
 Phobos [65](#)
 Phoinix, eponym of Phoinikia [36](#)
 Phoibidas, Spartan commander [146](#)
 Phoinikia/Phoinikian(s) [15](#)
 Phokaia [79](#)
 Phokion, Athenian general [161](#)
 Phokis/Phokian(s) [112–3](#), [152](#), [162](#)
 Phorbanteion [55](#)
 Phorbas, son of Poseidon [55](#)
 Phorbas, son of Thersippos [82](#)
 Phormion [123](#)
 Phoroneus, king of Argos [18](#), [196](#)
Phoronis [6](#), [23](#), [175](#), [196](#)
 Phrastor [23](#)
 phratry/phratries/phrateres [18](#), [78](#), [81](#), [184–5](#), [192](#)
 Phreatto [76](#)
 Phthiotis/Phthiotian(s) [164–5](#)
 Phye [90–91](#)
phylai (tribes) [101](#), [185](#)
 Phyle, fort [139–40](#), [186](#)
 Phyllis [76](#)
 Physkos [141](#)
 Pindar, lyric poet [14](#), [43](#), [95](#), [193](#)
 Pittheus, of Troizen [51](#), [57](#)
 Plakie [25](#)
 Plataia/Plataian(s): [66](#), [122](#), [136](#);
 Battle of [102](#), [105–6](#), [108–9](#), [122](#)
 Plato, comic poet [116](#)
 Plato, philosopher [155–7](#)
 Ploutarkhos, tyrant of Eretria [161](#)
 Plynteria, Athenian festival [200](#)
 Pnyx [64–5](#), [97](#), [101](#), [119–20](#)
 Polemon [44](#), [55](#)
 Polyneikes, son of Oidipous [70](#)
pompeia (ceremonial equipment) [148–9](#)
 Pontos [66](#), [162](#)
 Poseidon: [46–7](#), [63](#), [67](#), [97](#), [98–9](#), [182](#), [206](#), [214–5](#);
 contest with Athena [22](#), [46–7](#);
 Erekhtheus [47](#), [217](#);
 Helikonian [176](#);
 lawsuit against Ares [27](#), [30](#), [33–4](#);

priest of [44](#);
temple of [168](#)
Potamoi/Parapotamoi [216](#)
Poteidaia/Poteidaian(s) [119](#), [150](#)
Prasiai (Portoraphti) [29–30](#), [190](#), [203–4](#)
Praxagora [143](#)
Praxiphanes [116](#)
Praxithea:
 wife of Erekhtheus [215](#);
 wife of Erikhthonios [42](#)
Priene [78](#)
Priestesses of Argos [206–7](#)
Proarktouria [177](#)
Probalinthos, Attic deme [181](#)
probouloi [132](#)
Proeresia [177](#)
Prohedroi [168](#)
Prooikia [177](#)
Prokleides [92–3](#)
Prokne [42](#)
Prokris, daughter of Erekhtheus [34](#), [43](#), [206–7](#), [209](#), [215](#)
promanteia [112](#)
Propylaia (*propylaia*) [27](#), [119](#)
Protogeneia, daughter of Erekhtheus [43](#), [216](#)
Protogonia [7](#), [97](#), [176](#)
Protokles [17](#)
Protokreon [17](#)
Prytaneion [90](#)
Psammetikhe, island [181](#)
Psammetikhos, king of Egypt [114](#)
Ptolemy Philadelphos, king of Egypt [8](#)
Pyanepsion, Athenian month [81](#), [177](#), [183](#)
Pyanopsia Athenian festival [62](#)
Pydna [150](#)
Pylas, king of Megara [49](#)
Pylos [80](#), [124](#)
Pyrrha [21](#), [79](#), [193](#)
Pythia/Pythian [80](#), [94–5](#)
Pythodoros:
 archon (432/1) [117](#), [121](#);
 archon (404/3) [139](#);
 Athenian general [123–4](#);
 Dadoukhos [173](#)

Reserve Fund [119](#), [133](#)
Rhamnous [47](#)
Rhea [23](#), [194](#)
Rheneia [182](#)
Rhinthon, of Taras [184](#)
Rhodes/Rhodian(s) [142](#), [151](#), [216](#)

Sacred Orgas, at Eleusis [117](#), [153–4](#)
Sacred Road [217](#)

Sacred trireme(s) [152](#), [171](#)
 Sacred War(s) [112–13](#)
Salaminia, sacred trireme [171](#)
 Salaminioi, Athenian *genos* [60](#), [63](#), [201](#)
 Salamis: [9](#), [58](#), [60](#);
 battle of [102–4](#)
 Salmoneus [79](#)
 Samos/Samian(s) [79](#), [116](#), [153](#)
 Saturn [21](#)
Saturnalia, Roman festival [194](#)
 Satyros, historian [167](#)
 Scylla, daughter of Nisos [51](#)
 Scythia (Skythia), Scythians (Skythians) [6](#), [66](#), [165](#), [182](#)
seisakhtheia [88–9](#)
 Selene [177](#)
 Seleukos [184](#)
 Selinous [18](#)
 Semakheion [212](#)
 Semakhos/Semakhidai [36–7](#), [39](#), [212](#)
 Semele, mother of Dionysos [36](#), [210–11](#)
 Semnai Theai (August Goddesses) [177](#), [205](#)
 Semos, author [181–2](#)
 Sicily/Sicilian(s): [43](#), [68](#), [123–4](#), [128–9](#), [131](#), [184](#);
 Expedition [128–9](#), [131–3](#)
 Simon, archon (591/0) [113](#)
 Simonides, of Keos, lyric poet [65](#), [93](#), [104](#)
 Sinis [53](#), [54](#), [69](#)
 Sintian(s) [24](#), [197](#)
 Skione/Skionaian(s) [125](#)
 Skira/Skiraphoria, Athenian festival [44–5](#), [217](#)
 Skiron (*skiron*) [45](#), [49](#), [217](#)
 Skirophorion, Athenian month [44](#), [74](#), [161](#), [201](#), [217](#)
 Skiros:
 Eleusinian prophet [45](#), [217](#);
 of Salamis [58](#), [60](#)
 Skylake [25](#)
 Skyros [66](#), [72](#)
 Social war [150–51](#)
 Sokrates, of Anagyrous [116](#)
 Sokrates, philosopher [120](#), [137](#)
 Solon/Solonian [3](#), [11](#), [49](#), [53](#), [81](#), [87–90](#), [94](#), [97](#), [101](#), [169](#), [187](#), [207–8](#), [216–7](#)
 Sophokles, Athenian general, [123–4](#)
 Sophokles, of Kolonos, poet [116](#), [177](#)
 Sosigenes, archon (342/1) [161](#), [163](#)
Soteres (Saviours) [171](#)
 Souniades, of Akharnai, archon (397/6) [140–1](#)
 Sparta/Spartan(s) [16](#), [67](#), [94–5](#), [105](#), [108–9](#), [122](#), [124–5](#), [133–4](#), [135](#), [140](#), [142](#), [144–6](#), [147](#), [188](#)

 Spartiate(s) [122](#)
 Spartoi [15](#), [16](#)
 Speusippos, philosopher [156–7](#)
 Sphettos/Sphettian [21](#), [54–5](#), [192](#)

Sphinx [70](#)
 Spina/Spinis, river [23](#), [196](#)
 Stephanephoros, hero [175](#)
 Stesikhoros, poet [15](#)
 Stilbides, seer [131](#)
 Stoa Poikile [66](#)
strategos/strategoi (generals) [107](#), [116](#), [123](#)
stratiotika (military fund) [111](#)
 Stratokles, politician [171](#), [173](#)
 Stryme [149–50](#), [179](#)
 Styx [19](#), [183](#)
 Sycanus, king of Sicily [68](#)
 symmory/symmories [97](#), [101](#), [146–7](#)
syngrapheis [132](#)
 Synkellos, Georgios, chronographer [2](#), [38](#), [42](#), [69](#), [85](#), [191](#), [212–3](#)
Synoikia, Athenian festival [62](#)
synoikismos/synoecism [14](#), [23](#), [50](#), [52–3](#), [55](#), [72](#), [191](#), [213](#)
 Syracuse/Syracusan(s) [83](#), [131](#)
 Syria/Syrian(s) [43](#), [141](#)

Tainaron, cape [167](#)
 Talos, nephew of Daidalos [34](#), [207](#)
 Taurian(s) [182](#)
 Tauros [58–61](#)
 Taygetos [108](#)
 Tegea/Tegean(s) [66](#), [67](#), [105](#)
teikhopoioi [144](#)
 Teisandros, archon (414/13) [130](#)
 Telemakhos [128](#)
 Telos, island [179](#)
 Ten, the:
 at Athens [139–40](#);
 in Peiraieus [139–40](#)
 Tenos [204](#)
 Teos [79](#)
 Tetrakomoi [21](#), [192](#)
 Tetrapolis [21](#), [52](#), [56](#), [181](#), [192](#), [216](#)
 Teukros/Teukris [15](#), [75](#)
 Thallos (*FGrHist* 256) [18–19](#)
Thargelia, Athenian festival [185](#)
 Thargelion, Athenian month [73–4](#), [185](#)
 Thasos/Thasian(s) [108](#), [149–50](#)
 Thaulon [178](#)
 Thea/Theans [184](#)
 Theagenides, archon (468/7) [108–9](#)
 Thebes/Theban(s) [14–17](#), [54](#), [70–1](#), [143](#), [146](#), [162](#), [164–5](#), [182](#), [193](#)
 Themistokles [11](#), [60](#), [94](#), [102–5](#), [189](#)
 Themistokles, archon (347/6) [162](#)
 Theodoros, archon (438/7) [117](#)
 Theokritos, of Khios [157](#)
 Theophilos, archon (348/7) [155–6](#)
 Theophrastos, philosopher [169](#), [189–90](#)
 Theophrastos, of Halai, archon (340/39) [161–4](#)

Theopompos, archon (411/10) [133](#)
theoria (sacred embassy) [30](#)
 theorikon/theorika [111–112](#)
 Theoris, prophetess [165–6](#)
 Theozotides [189](#)
 Theramenes, Athenian politician [137–8](#)
 Thermodon, river [66](#)
 Thermopylai: [36–7](#), [39](#), [151–2](#), [165](#);
 battle at [102](#)
 Thersippos, son of Arkhippos [82](#)
 Theseia, Athenian festival [65](#)
 Theseion [65–6](#), [68](#), [187](#)
 Theseus, son of Aigeus, king of Athens [13](#), [14](#), [21](#), [23](#) [41](#), [50–51](#), [52–72](#), [73–6](#), [99](#),
[187–8](#), [191–2](#), [205](#), [217](#)
thesmothetai [87](#), [168](#)
 Thespious, son of Ariphron [83](#)
 Thessaly/Thessalian(s) [24](#), [113](#), [164–5](#)
 Thirty the, tyrants at Athens [139–40](#), [146](#), [148](#), [169](#), [186](#)
 Thorikos [21](#), [192](#)
 Thoudemos, archon (353/2) [151](#)
 Thourii/Thourian(s) [142](#)
 Thrace/Thrake/Thracian(s)/Thrakian(s) [46](#), [91](#), [123](#), [149–50](#), [174](#), [180](#), [214–15](#)
 Thrasyboulos, of Steiria [139–40](#), [146](#), [186](#)
 Thrasylllos, Athenian general [137](#), [142](#)
 Thucydides, son of Melesias [115–6](#)
 Thucydides, son of Oloros, historian [23](#), [116](#), [132](#)
 Thukydides, poet [116](#)
 Thymaitadai, Attic deme [57](#), [78](#)
 Thymaitis [78](#), [84](#)
 Thymoites, king of Athens [13–14](#), [77–8](#), [80–1](#)
 Thymokhares, of Sphettos [8](#)
 Thyrea [181](#)
 Thyrion/Thourion/Thyrian(s)/Thourian(s) [181](#)
 Timokles, archon (441/0) [116](#)
 Timokrite, of Aphidna [200](#)
 Timotheus, son of Konon [150–1](#), [153](#), [156–7](#)
 Torone [150](#)
 treasurers, of Athena and other gods [137](#)

Trikorynthos, Attic deme [181](#)
 Triptolemos, [42](#), [45–6](#), [213–4](#)
 Tritopatores [17–18](#)
trittys/trittyes [97](#), [185](#), [192](#)
 Troad [15](#), [17](#)
Troika [6](#)
 Troizen [52](#), [54](#), [57](#), [69](#), [178](#)
 Trojan War [13](#), [17](#), [38](#), [47](#), [73–85](#), [207](#)
 Troy [73–4](#)
 Two Goddesses (Demeter and Kore Persephone) [117](#), [153–4](#)
 Tyrrhenia (Tyrenia)/Tyrrhenian(s) [23](#), [24](#), [196–7](#)

Venus [188](#)

Xanthios, Boiotian king [77–8](#), [79–80](#)
Xanthippos, archon (479/8) [102](#), [104–5](#)
Xenopatra [79](#)
Xenophon of Melite [116](#)
Xerxes, king of Persia [102–5](#)
Xouthos, son of Hellen [79](#), [215](#)
Xypete/Xypetaian(s) [15](#), [190](#)

Zeus: [21](#), [42](#), [67](#), [79](#);
 Hekalesios [56](#);
 Herkeios [172](#);
 Hypatos [46](#), [194](#);
 Morian [122](#);
 Olympian [30](#);
 Planner [43](#);
 Polieus [195](#);
 Saviour [37](#);
 statue at Olympia [117–18](#);
 Teleios [194](#)
Zeuxippe, wife of Pandion I [42](#)
Zoster [204](#)